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This dissertation considers the role that court dress played in the formation of Mongol cultural and political identity in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. By defining and analyzing the fashion system of the Mongol court principally in Yuan China, but also in Ilkhanid Iran, it demonstrates how the Mongols were able to manipulate symbols and ceremonies effectively via costume in the formation of their empire. Most art historical studies of the Yuan dynasty have focused on painting by Han Chinese “exiled” painters, ignoring Mongol contributions to the art and material culture of the dynasty. This dissertation initiates an understanding of the particular aesthetics of the Yuan dynasty, which incorporated diverse cultural traditions through textiles and dress. In addition, as no systematic study of Mongol dress has been written, this is the first such study that brings together analysis of the decorative motifs, weave structures, and tailoring of excavated costumes and textiles, alongside pictorial representations and contemporary textual descriptions. To understand the genesis and development of the Mongol courtly vestimentary system, which evolved in such a short period of time, antecedents from the Steppe, Central Asia, China, and the Islamic world are considered. Concordances and discrepancies among this evidence allow for hypotheses about what the Mongol court actually wore, how it wished to be portrayed, and how others saw it. These hypotheses reveal much about the aspirations of the Mongol empire on one hand, and the anxieties they elicited, on the other.
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Figure 1.53 Usnisavijaya Mandala, detail of female donor, Tangut (12th-early 13th centuries). Painting on wood, h. 111, w. 131 cm. The State Hermitage Museum (Piotrovsky, Lost Empire of the Silk Road, pl. 21, p. 143).

Figure 1.54 Female donors from Guanyin, Tangut (12th century). Scroll on silk, h. 97.5cm, w. 59 cm. The State Hermitage Museum (Piotrovsky, Lost Empire of the Silk Road, pl. 49, p. 206).

Figure 2.1 Textile fragment with felines and eagles. Lampas weave. Warp: 170.5 cm; weft: 109 cm. Eastern Iranian world, mid-13th century. The Cleveland Museum of Art. Purchase from the J.H. Wade Fund, 1990.2 (WSWG cat. 43, 154-155).

Figure 2.2 Two lampas-woven textile fragments. Silk and gilded lamella of animal substrate, both spun around a silk core and woven flat. Eastern Islamic area, mid-13th century. David Collection, Copenhagen, 4/1993, 15/1989 (photo by Pernille Klemp, David Collection).
Figure 2.3 Fragment of a lampas-woven textile. Silk and gilded lamella of animal substrate both spun around a silk core and woven flat. Eastern Islamic area, mid-13th century. Warp: 113 cm; weft: 32 cm. David Collection, Copenhagen, 14/1992 (photo by Pernille Klemp, David Collection).

Figure 2.4 Textile fragment with reclining djeiran in teardrop shape. Tabby with supplementary weft of gold strips. Mingshui, 13th century. Warp: 21 cm, weft: 43 cm. Inner Mongolia Institute of Archaeology, Hohhot (Zhao, Treasures in Silk, cat. 5.08, 172-3).

Figure 2.5 Textile fragment with makara roundel. Tabby with supplementary weft of gold strips. Mingshui, early 13th century. Diameter of roundel: 27-28 cm. Inner Mongolia Institute of Archaeology, Hohhot (Zhao, Treasures in Silk, cat. 6.08, 201).

Figure 2.6 Textile fragment with djeiran, floral branches and moon. Red silk tabby with supplementary weft of gold strips. Jin dynasty (1115-1234). Warp: 109.8 cm; weft: 38.5 cm. Cleveland Museum of Art, purchase from the J.H. Wade Fund, 1991.4 (WSWG cat. 29, 114-115).

Figure 2.7 Textile fragment with reclining djeiran, floral branches, clouds, and moon. Yellow silk tabby brocaded with gilded strips, Jin dynasty (1115-1234). Warp: 50.5 cm; weft: 61.5 cm. Musée Guimet, AEDTA 3430 (photo by Eiren Shea).

Figure 2.8 Textile Fragment with makaras, phoenixes, and flowers. Lampas weave (nasīj). Central Asia or Dadu, Mongol period (13th century). Warp: 51.3 cm; weft: 75.6 cm. Cleveland Museum of Art, Purchase from the J.H. Wade Fund, 1991.5 a,b (WSWG cat. 41, 152).

Figure 2.9 Two fragments with phoenixes and makaras. Lampas weave, silk with supplementary weft of gilded lamella on paper, spun around a silk core. Central Asia or Dadu, Mongol period (13th century). Fragment a: warp: 17 cm; weft: 75 cm; fragment b: warp: 16.5 cm; weft: 75 cm. David Collection, Copenhagen, 46 a-b/1992 (Folsach and Bernsted Woven Treasures, cat. 18, 54; 102)

Figure 2.10 Textile fragment with confronted birds in palmettes. Blue silk tabby with supplementary weft of gold strips. North China, Mongol period (13th – mid-14th century). Total dimensions: warp: 58 cm; weft: 63 cm; pattern dimensions: height (warp): 17 cm, width (weft): 14 cm. Musée Guimet, AEDTA 3262 (photo by Eiren Shea).

Figure 2.11 Textile fragment with scrolling motifs in palmettes. Green silk tabby with supplementary weft of gold strips. Mongol period (13th – mid-14th century). Total dimensions: warp: 41 cm; weft: 61.5 cm; pattern dimensions: height (warp): 17 cm, width (weft): 13.5/14 cm. Musée Guimet, AEDTA 3747 (photo by Eiren Shea).
Figure 2.12 Textile fragment with floral motifs in palmettes. Red silk tabby with supplementary weft of gold strips. Mongol period (13th-mid-14th century). Total dimensions: warp: 98/102 cm; weft: 34 cm; pattern dimensions: height (warp): 13-15 cm, width (weft): 12.5 cm. Musée Guimet, AEDTA 3380 (photo by Eiren Shea).


Figure 2.14 Detail of phoenixes among clouds. Blue tabby silk with supplementary pattern weft in gold lamella on animal substrate. China, Jin dynasty (12th-13th century). Warp: 60.5 cm; weft: 63 cm. Musée Guimet, AEDTA 3086 (photo by Eiren Shea).


Figure 2.16 Boot with pattern of flowers on purple background. Kesi with lampas border. Excavated from the tombs of the Wanggu clan, Mingshui Damaoqi, Inner Mongolia. Mongol Period (early 13th century). Warp: 45 cm, weft: 26 cm. Inner Mongolia Museum, Hohhot (Zhao, Treasures in Silk, cat. 5.04, 165).

Figure 2.17 Kesi fragment on blue background. Red, green, purple, light blue silk; gold threads. China, 13th century (found in Tibet). Warp: 106 cm; weft: 42.5 cm. Musée Guimet, AEDTA 3365 (photo by Eiren Shea).

Figure 2.18 Fragment with repeat motif of coiled dragons. Tabby weave with a double warp. Purple silk and gilded lamella of animal substrate. Warp: 37.5 cm; weft: 61 cm. Musée Guimet, AEDTA 3746 (photo by Eiren Shea).

Figure 2.19 Fragment with repeat motif of rabbits. Tabby weave with a double warp. Red and purple silk; gilded lamella of animal substrate. Jin dynasty (Carbon dated 1240-1400). Warp: 59 cm; weft: 31 cm. Musée Guimet, AEDTA 3269 (photo by Eiren Shea).

Figure 2.20 Textile fragment with dragons and partial cloud-collar medallion. Kesi. Central Asia, 13th century (or earlier). Warp: 59.7 cm; weft: 31.1 cm. Chris Hall Collection, Hong Kong (WSWG, fig. 26, 75).

Figure 2.21 Female robe with cloud collar pattern and wide sleeves, silk twill brocade. Warp: 163 cm, weft: 206 cm, Private collection (Zhao, Gold Silk Blue and White, pl. 31).
Figure 2.22 Textile fragment showing lions with palmettes. Kesi. Central Asia, Mongol period (13th century or earlier). Warp: 63.5 cm; weft: 34.7 cm. The Cleveland Museum of Art, purchase from the J.H. Wade Fund, 1991.3 (WSWG cat. 19, 80-81).

Figure 2.23 Musée Guimet AEDTA 3277. Warp: 10.5 cm; weft: 21 cm. Black silk background, orange, green blue, white, green, grey silk and gold thread decoration (photo by Eiren Shea).

Figure 2.24 Sasanian architectural design of palmette. Stucco roundel. Sassanian (6th century). 62.2 cm. Metropolitan Museum of Art, Rogers Fund, 32.150.1 (Metropolitan Museum of Art Collection Online).

Figure 2.25 Folio from a Quran manuscript with palmette decorations. Ink and gold on parchment. Central or Eastern Islamic lands, first half of 10th c. Height 13 cm; width 10.5 cm. Metropolitan Museum of Art, Rogers Fund, 37.30 (Metropolitan Museum of Art Collection Online).

Figure 2.26 Three textile fragments with elephant, stupa, lotus, lion, and Chinese characters (連，獅，華，白，右). Silk, possibly weft-faced compound tabby weave (taqueté). Northern China, 5th-6th century. Chris Hall Collection, Hong Kong (photo by Eiren Shea).

Figure 2.27 Lustre painted bowl with lion and kufic script. Egypt, Fatimid period (12th century). Kuwait National Museum LNS 167 C, al-Sabah collection (Fisher Fine Arts Image Collection, University of Pennsylvania).

Figure 2.28 23 Cloth of Gold with Winged Lions and Griffins. Lampas, grey and coral silk, supplementary weft of gold strips on paper substrate. Warp: 124 cm; weft: 48.8 cm. Central Asia (mid-13th century). Cleveland Museum of Art, 1989.50 (WSWG, cat. 35).

Figure 2.29 Detail of confronted lions from the bianxian (“braided waist”) robe. Silk and metallic thread lampas with silk and metallic thread samite underflap. Excavated from the tombs of the Wanggu clan, Mingshui Damaoqi, Inner Mongolia. Mongol Period (early 13th century). Length (collar to hem): 142 cm; width (across sleeves): 246 cm. Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region Museum, Hohhot (Zhao Feng, Treasures in Silk, 193, fig. 6.04).

Figure 2.30 Textile fragment with pseudo-kufic script. Silk compound tabby with supplementary weft of gold strips. Excavated from the tombs of the Wanggu clan, Mingshui Damaoqi, Inner Mongolia. Mongol Period (early 13th century). Warp: 37 cm; weft: 45 cm. Inner Mongolia Institute of Archaeology, Hohhot (Zhao, Chinese Silks, Figure 7.12 a, b, 342).
Figure 2.31 Detail of textile fragment with birds in roundels. Silk and metallic thread lampas. Beijing, Yuan Dynasty (13th-mid-14th century). Length: 23.6 cm; width: 17.5 cm. China National Silk Museum, Hangzhou, 3217 (photo by Eiren Shea).

Figure 2.32 Left half of a lampas-woven textile. Silk, gilded paper, and gilded animal substrate. China or the eastern Islamic world, Mongol period (1st half of 14th century). Warp: 228 cm; weft: 63.5 cm. David Collection, Copenhagen, 40/1997 (photo by Pernille Klemp, David Collection).

Figure 2.33 Detail of pseudo-inscription from a fragment of a lampas-woven textile. Eastern Islamic area, mid-13th century. David Collection, Copenhagen, 14/1992 (photo by Pernille Klemp, David Collection).

Figure 2.34 Detail of pseudo-inscription from a lampas-woven caftan. Eastern Islamic world or China, 1st half of the 14th century. David Collection, Copenhagen, 23/2004 (photo by Pernille Klemp, David Collection).

Figure 2.35 Drawing of pseudo-inscription on the nasīj braided-waist robe. Rossi and Rossi Collection, London (drawing by Eiren Shea).

Figure 2.36 Drawing of the pseudo-inscription from a lampas-woven (nasīj) robe. Silk and metallic threads. China or Central Asia, Mongol Period (13th-mid-14th century). Chris Hall Collection, Hong Kong.

Figure 2.37 Inscription h, Comares Hall, Alahambra Palace, Granada, Spain (Puerta Vilchez, Reading the Alhambra, 127-128).

Figure 2.38 A blue-glazed alif-lam knot. Ilkhanid period (13th-14th centuries). The Louvre Museum, Paris, MAO 2010 (photo by Eiren Shea).

Figure 2.39 A frieze with a Quranic inscription with the tops of the letters forming a decorative knot. Ilkhanid period (13th-14th centuries). Musée des Arts Décoratifs, Paris AD7 642 (photo by Eiren Shea).

Figure 2.40 Textile fragment, inscribed with name of Abu Bakr, ruler of Fars (r. 1226-1260). Lampas weave, silk and gilded lamella of animal substrate, both spun around a silk core and woven flat. Eastern Islamic area, mid-13th century (c. 1260). Warp: 66.5 cm; weft: 41 cm. David Collection, Copenhagen, 20/1994 (photo by Pernille Klemp).

Figure 2.41 Silk and gold tīrāz in the name of the Ilkhanid Abu Sa’ıd. Western Iran, 1319-1335. Dom und Döuzensanmuseum, Vienna (Folsach, “A Set of Silk Panel from the Mongol Period,” Fig. 225).
Figure 2.42 Silk and gold tirāz naming Nasir al-Din Muhammad (71x22 cm), Central Asia, first half of the 14th century. Museum für Kunst und Kulturgeschichte der Hansestadt, Lübeck, TE.40 (Folsach, “A Set of Silk Panel from the Mongol Period,” fig. 226).

Figure 2.43 Bianxian (“braided waist”) robe. Silk and metallic thread lampas with silk and metallic thread samit underflap. Excavated from the tombs of the Wanggu clan, Mingshui Damaoqi, Inner Mongolia. Mongol Period (early 13th century). Length (collar to hem): 142 cm; width (across sleeves): 246 cm. Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region Museum, Hohhot (The World of Khubilai Khan, 74, fig. 102).

Figure 2.44 Lampas-woven (nasīj) robe. Silk and metallic threads. China or Central Asia, Mongol Period (13th-mid-14th century). Length (collar to hem): 128.5 cm; width (sleeve to sleeve): 189 cm. Chris Hall Collection, Hong Kong (courtesy of Chris Hall).

Figure 2.45 Caftan sewn from a lampas-woven textile. Silk with gilded lamella of animal substrate. Eastern Islamic world or China, 1st half of the 14th century. Length (collar to hem): 130 cm; width (sleeve to sleeve): 195 cm. David Collection, Copenhagen, 23/2004 (Pernille Klemp, David Collection).

Figure 2.46 Bianxian (“braided waist”) robe. Silk and metallic thread lampas (nasīj). China or Central Asia, Mongol period (13th-mid-14th century). Length (collar to hem): 123 cm; width (sleeve to sleeve): 202 cm. Rossi and Rossi, London (Zhao Feng, Gold Silk Blue and White, pl. 28).

Figure 2.47 Robe with ribboned waist decoration. Twill damask. China (?), Mongol Period (13th-mid-14th century). Length (collar to hem): 126 cm; width (sleeve to sleeve): 218 cm. Rossi and Rossi, London (Zhao Feng, Gold Silk Blue and White, pl. 32)

Figure 2.48 Bianxian (“braided waist”) robe. Silk tabby with supplementary wefts of gilt thread. China, Mongol period (13th-mid-14th century). Length (collar to hem): 202 cm; width: (sleeve to sleeve): 117 cm. China National Silk Museum, Hangzhou (Du ciel à la terre, cat. 38).

Figure 2.49 Anon., Hunting Geese (sheyan tu 射雁圖). Yuan dynasty (14th century). Hanging scroll, ink and colors on silk. Length (collar to hem): 131.8 cm; width: 93.9 cm. National Palace Museum, Taipei (Da Han de shiji, pl. 1-13).

Figure 2.50 Illustration of a Mongol archer, Shilin guangji (Chen Yuanjing Xutiao siku quanshu, vol. 1218, 387).

Figure 2.51 Belt of King of the state of Qi. Silk and gold threads. Jin dynasty (12th century), unearthed in 1988 outside Chiengzicun, in Juyuan county in Heilongjiang province (Zhu Qixin “Royal Costumes of the Jin Dynasty,” fig. 6, 62).
Figure 2.52 Painting of tomb occupants, north, northeast, and northwest walls. Yuan dynasty (1269), excavated in 1998 from the Dongercun (洞耳村) tomb, Pucheng (蒲城) county, Shaanxi (Kaogu yu wenwu, no. 1, 2000).

Figure 2.53 Painting of tomb occupants, north wall, Yuan dynasty (c. 1279-1368), excavated from the Sanyanjing tomb, Chifeng, Inner Mongolia (Xu Guangji, Zhongguo chu tu bi hua quan ji, vol. 3, fig. 222).

Figure 2.54 Detail of maids serving tea, wall mural. tomb M2 at Kangzhuangcun, Shanxi. 13th Year of Zhiyuan Era (1276 CE), Yuan dynasty. Height: c. 159 cm; width: c. 146 cm. Preserved in the Changzhi Museum, China (Xu Guangji, Zhongguo chu tu bi hua quan ji, vol. 2, fig. 194).

Figure 2.55 Enthronement scene. Illustration from the Diez Albums, Iran (possibly Tabriz), early 14th century. Ink and colors on paper. Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin (Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Orientabteilung, Diez fol. 70, S. 10).

Figure 2.56 Yuan female robe with nasīj border and wide sleeves. Metallic thread lampas (nasīj) and twill. Length: 228 cm; width: 165.5 cm, Private collection (Zhao Feng, Gold Silk Blue and White, pl. 30).

Figure 2.57 Front closing Uighur dress, line drawing (Gabain, Das Leben im uigurischen Königreich von Qoco, fig. 123).

Figure 2.58 Line drawing of a Uighur woman wearing a boqta (Gabain, Das Leben im uigurischen Königreich von Qoco, fig. 124).

Figure 2.59 Anige, Portrait of Chabi, 1294. Album leaf, ink and colors on silk. Height: 61.5 cm; width: 48 cm. National Palace Museum, Taipei (Wikimedia commons).

Figure 2.60 Ornament from a boqta headdress. Gold and carnelian, Excavated in 2001 from a Yuan tomb near the Eng’er River, Xilin Gol League, Inner Mongolia. Height: 6.1 cm; width: 6 cm. Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region Museum (The World of Khubilai Khan, 82, fig. 114).

Figure 2.61 Boqta (gugu) headdress. Embroidery, silk and metallic thread lampas (nasīj), and knots. China or Central Asia, Mongol period (13th-mid-14th century). Height: 38 cm. Private collection (Zhao Feng, Gold Silk Blue and White, 66).

Figure 2.62 Covering for a boqta (gugu) headdress. Gugu boqta, silk and metallic thread lampas (nasīj). China or Central Asia, Mongol period (13th-mid-14th century). China National Silk Museum, Hangzhou (photo by Eiren Shea).
Figure 3.1 Anige, *Portrait of Khubilai*. 1294, Yuan dynasty. Album leaf, colors and ink on silk. Height: 59.1; width: 47.6 cm. National Palace Museum, Taipei (*The World of Khubilai Khan*, 4, fig. 1)

Figure 3.2 Blue tabby silk fragment with a repeat pattern of dragons in gilded supplementary weft in palmettes. Yuan dynasty (c. 1271-1368). Warp: 31cm; weft: 57cm Chris Hall Collection, Hong Kong (photo by Eiren Shea).

Figure 3.3 Drawing of a robe with badge with design of falcon chasing a hare. Gold brocaded lampas on silk twill damask. Height: 140; width (sleeves): 222 cm. Private Collection, China (drawing by Eiren Shea).

Figure 3.4 Liu Guandao (active c. 1275-1300). *Khubilai Khan Hunting*, dated 1280. Hanging scroll, ink and color on silk. 182.9 cm x 104.1 cm. National Palace Museum, Taipei (Wikimedia commons).

Figure 3.5 Anonymous. *Judging Horses*. Yuan Dynasty (1271-1368). Ink and color on silk, 27.0 cm x 211.8 cm. Jilin Provincial Museum (*Yuan hua quan ji*, vol. 3, part 2, fig. 65).

Figure 3.6 Detail of Emperors Tugh Tëmur and Khoshila from from *Mandala of Yamantaka-Vajrabhairava*, c. 1330-1332. Silk tapestry (*kesi*). Warp: 245.5 cm; weft: 208.9 cm. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1992.54 (Metropolitan Museum of Art Online Collection).

Figure 3.7 Detail of Khubilai Khan from *Khubilai Khan Hunting*

Figure 3.8 Detail of attendant with *xiongbei* from *Khubilai Khan Hunting*

Figure 3.9 Detail of archer wearing robe with underarm openings from *Khubilai Khan Hunting*

Figure 3.10 Detail of attendant wearing robe with underarm openings from *Khubilai Khan Hunting*

Figure 3.11 Detail of Chabi wearing robe with underarm openings from *Khubilai Khan Hunting*

Figure 3.12 Robe with underarm openings. Silk with supplementary weft of lamella of animal substrate formally gilded. Yuan dynasty (1271-1368). China National Silk Museum, Hangzhou (photo by Eiren Shea).
Figure 3.13 Robe with underarm openings. Yuan dynasty (1271-1368). Twill damask with couched appliqué. Length: 119 cm; width: 224 cm. Collection of Rossi and Rossi, Ltd. (Zhao Feng, *Gold Silk Blue and White*, 52-53, cat. 27).

Figure 3.14 Pair of Men. White pottery with “straw-colored” glaze pigments, height 19.5 cm, Tang dynasty, c. 8th-9th century (Baker, *Appeasing the spirits*, fig. 18).

Figure 3.15 Drawing of caftan with underarm openings, Central Asia, 9th-10th century. Silk samite. Abegg-Stiftung inv. no. 5357 (drawing by Eiren Shea).

Figure 3.16 Mural showing tomb occupants. Height: 70 cm; width: 210 cm. Yuan at tomb Houdesheng in Guoxiaoyaoxiang, Liangzhengxian, Inner Mongolia. Unearthed 1990. Preserved in the Inner Mongolia Museum, Hohhot (Xu Guangji, *Zhongguo chu tu bi hua quan ji*, vol. 3, fig. 226).

Figure 3.17 Mural showing a servant figure. Height: 71 cm; width: 50 cm. Yuan tomb at Zhoumacun in Changzhi, Shanxi. Yuan Dynasty, 11th year of Dade (1307 CE). Not preserved (Xu Guangji, *Zhongguo chu tu bi hua quan ji*, vol. 2, fig. 205).

Figure 3.18 Mural showing tomb occupant couple seated beside table. Height: c. 70 cm. Yuan tomb at the Smelting Plant in Iron and Steel, Xingtai, Hebei. Yuan dynasty (1271-1368). Not preserved (Xu Guangji, *Zhongguo chu tu bi hua quan ji*, vol. 1, fig. 201).

Figure 3.19 Detail of musician figure. Yuan tomb in Xilizhuang, Yuncheng, Shanxi dated after 1310. Preserved in the Institute of Archaeology in Shanxi (Xu Guangji, *Zhongguo chu tu bi hua quan ji*, fig. 210).

Figure 3.20 Zhao Mengfu, *Groom and Horse*, Yuan Dynasty, 1296. Handscroll, ink and color on paper. Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1988.135 (The Metropolitan Museum of Art Online Collection).

Figure 3.21 Door guard, 9th Year of Da'an Era, Liao (1093 CE), height 100 cm, width 40 cm. Unearthed from Zhang Kuangzheng's tomb (M10) at Xibali in Xuanhua, Hebei, preserved on original site (Xu Guangji, *Zhongguo chu tu bi hua quan ji*, fig. 139).

Figure 3.22 Tomb Occupants Seated at Table (Replica). Jin to Yuan dynasty (c. 12th-13th centuries), height c. 80 cm, width c. 120. Unearthed from tomb M2 at Shizhuangcun in Jinxing, Hebei. Preserved in the Cultural Relics Institute Hebei Province (Xu Guangji, *Zhongguo chu tu bi hua quan ji*, vol. 1, fig. 187).

Figure 3.23 Standing attendant figure in the Yuan tomb at Wangshangcun in Dengfeng, Henan currently in the Zhengzhou Municipal Institute of Cultural Relics and Archaeology (Xu Guangji, *Zhongguo chu tu bi hua quan ji*, vol. 5, fig. 192).
Figure 3.24 Jade belt hook, from tombs of Wang Shixian clan, Gansu (“Gansu Zhangxiang Yuandai Wang Shixian jiazu muzang,” Wenwu 2, 1982, pl. 2).

Figure 3.25 Figures serving wine. Excavated from the Qilu hotel, Yuan tomb (13th-14th centuries), northern foot of Qianfoshan in Jinan, Shandong. Preserved in Jinan Museum (Xu Guangji, Zhongguo chu tu bi hua quan ji, vol. 4, fig. 187).

Figure 3.26 Detail of male figure from a tomb occupant couple. Yuan tomb (13th-14th centuries) at Xingcun in Ganggouxhen, Licheng district, Jinan, Shandong (Xu Guangji, Zhongguo chu tu bi hua quan ji, vol. 4, fig 176).

Figure 3.27 Excavated hat from the Wang Shixian clan tombs. Yuan dynasty, 13th century (“Gansu Zhangxiang Yuandai Wang Shixian jiazu muzang,” Wenwu 2 (1982), pl. 1).

Figure 3.28 Hat, nasi lampas. Yuan dynasty, 13th-14th centuries. Height 33 cm, width 46.5 cm. Collection of Rossi & Rossi Ltd. (Zhao Feng, Gold, Silk, Blue and White, fig. 38).

Figure 3.29 Hood with confronted falcons. Yuan dynasty, 13th-14th centuries. Excavated from Mingshui, Damaoqi, Inner Mongolia. Collection of Inner Mongolian Museum, Hohhot (Zhao Feng, Gold, Silk, Blue and White, fig. 39).

Figure 3.30 Detail of green twill silk fragment with printed design in gold of a recumbent stag. 13th century. Warp: 14cm; weft: 25cm. Chris Hall Collection, Hong Kong (photo by Eiren Shea).

Figure 3.31 Woman’s jacket (back and front) with pattern of lotus pond and other vignettes. Silk embroidery on silk gauze. 58.1 x 107 cm. Excavated from Jininglu Ancient City (dated 1312), Chayouqian Banner, Wulanchhabu, Inner Mongolia, 1976. Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region Museum (The World of Khubilai Khan, 81, fig. 113)

Figure 3.32 Examples of female dress. Excavated from the Yuan tomb of Li Yu’an, dated 1350. Zou county, Shandong Province (“Zouxian Yuandai Li Yu’an mu qingli jianbao” “邹县元代李裕庵墓清理简报” (Summary report on the excavation of the Yuan tomb of Li Yu’an in Zou county), Wenwu 4 (1978), fig. 21).

Figure 3.33 Yuan sleeveless garment with “turtle back” (hexagonal) roundel background and brocaded flowers. Length: 68 cm; width: 49 cm; flower roundels diameter: 18 cm (including border around them); 14 cm (without border). Excavated in Qinghai. China National Silk Museum, Hangzhou, no. 2677 (photo by Eiren Shea).
Figure 3.34 Maid lighting a lamp. 10th Year of Dade Era, Yuan dynasty (1306 CE). Height: c. 110 cm; width: c. 50 cm. From tomb M1Kangzhuangcun, Tunliu, Shanxi. Preserved in Changzhi Museum (Xu, Guangji, Zhongguo chu tu bi hua quan ji, vol. 2, fig 200).

Figure 3.35 Yuan dynasty shoe cover with pattern of embroidered flowers and plants, Beijing (元代環編繡花卉紋緞鞋面). Length: 26 cm, width: 20 cm. China National Silk Museum, Hangzhou, no. 3238 (photo by Eiren Shea).

Figure 3.36 Yuan dynasty satin shoe covers with polychrome embroidered patterns of flowers and plants, Beijing. Length: 18 cm, width: 6.5 cm. China National Silk Museum, Hangzhou, no. 3239 (photo by Eiren Shea).

Figure 3.37 Illustration of the Imperial Guard of Honor (Lubu tu 鹿簿圖), Northern Song dynasty (960-1127). Ink and color on silk, 14.8 m x 51.4 cm, Museum of Chinese History, Beijing (Wikimedia commons).

Figure 4.1 Map of Mongol Territories after 1260, from the exhibition “The Legacy of Genghis Khan,” Los Angeles County Museum of Art (LACMA http://www.lacma.org/khan/map.htm Accessed March 30, 2014)

Figure 4.2 Iskandar Builds the Iron Rampart (detail), from the Shahnama. Iran, Tabriz, Ilkhanid period c 1330-1336. Opaque watercolor, ink, and gold on paper, Sackler Gallery S1986.104 (Freer-Sackler website: http://www.asia.si.edu/explore/shahnama/S1986.104.asp)

Figure 4.3 Ardashir captures Ardavan (detail), from the Shahnama. Iran, Tabriz, Ilkhanid period c 1330-1336. Opaque watercolor, ink, and gold on paper, Sackler Gallery S1986.103 (Freer-Sackler website: http://www.asia.si.edu/explore/shahnama/ardashirArdavan.asp).

Figure 4.4 Taynush before Iskandar and The Visit to the Brahmans, from the Shahnama. Iran, Tabriz, Ilkhanid period, c. 1330-1336. Opaque watercolor, ink, and gold on paper, 15.1 x 28.6 cm, Sackler Gallery S1986.105 (Freer-Sackler website: http://www.asia.si.edu/explore/shahnama/iskandar.asp).

Figure 4.5 Afrasiyab takes Siyavush as Prisoner, from the Shahnama. Iran, Tabriz, Ilkhanid period c. 1330-1336. Opaque watercolor, ink, and gold on paper. Freer Gallery of Art and Sackler Gallery F1931.21 (Smithsonian Learning Lab website: https://learninglab.si.edu/resources/view/178049).

Figure 4.6 Enthronement of Shah Zav (detail of kneeling figure), from the Shahnama. Iran, Tabriz, Ilkhanid period, c. 1330-1340. Ink, opaque watercolor, and gold on paper.

Figure 4.7 Dalmatic with patterns of stags and pelicans, lampas, silk and gold thread, Iran, 14th century. Length: 171.5 cm. Victoria and Albert Museum, London, no. 8361-1863 (photo by Eiren Shea).

Figure 4.8 Chasuble, lampas weave, silk and gold thread. Victoria and Albert Museum, London 594-1884 (Wardwell, Panni Tartarici, fig 62).

Figure 4.9 Detail of an enthronement scene, Jāmi’ al-tawârîk, folio 313, H. 1653. Ink and colors on paper. Ilkhanid period, c. 1314. Topkapı Saray Museum, Istanbul. (Topkapı Saray Museum Library).

Figure 4.10 Velvet with gold disks. Silk, gilt-metal thread; brocaded velvet. Ilkhanid period, c. 1300. Cleveland Museum of Art, Dudley P. Allen Fund, 1918.225 (photo by Eiren Shea).

Figure 4.11 Front and back of velvet patterned with gold disks. Silk and gilt-metal thread. Ilkhanid period, 13th-14th century. Warp: 21 cm; weft: 15 cm; disk diameter: 1.2 cm. Cooper-Hewitt, National Design Museum, Smithsonian Institution, New York, 1902-1-385 (Sonday, “A Group of Possibly Thirteenth-Century Velvets with Gold Disks in Offset Rows,” fig. 1).

Figure 4.12 Velvet patterned with gold disks. Silk and gilt-metal thread. Ilkhanid period (?). Disk diameter: 1.4 cm. Koninklijke Musea voor Kunst en Geschiedenis, Brussels, TX 464 (Sonday, “A Group of Possibly Thirteenth-Century Velvets with Gold Disks in Offset Rows,” fig. 3).

Figure 4.13 Six fragments of a gold fabric with scrolls, phoenixes, and peacocks. Persia, 13th-14th century. Abegg-Stiftung, Riggisberg, inv. no. 1705 a-f (Otavsky and Wardwell, Mittelalterliche Textilien II, 330).


Figure 4.15 Textile Fragment (Pattern woven silk with gilt and silvered tanned leather), Central Asia (possibly), 14th century. Victoria and Albert, no. 1301-1864 (photo by Eiren Shea).
Figure 4.16 Textile with lotus blossoms. Greater Iran, 14th century. Lampas weave (twill and tabby), silk and gold thread. Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Kunstgewerbemuseum, K6118 (The Legacy of Genghis Khan, fig. 199 and cat. 76).

Figure 4.17 Alleged dalmatic of Benedict XI (d. 1304). Lampas weave, tabby ground with pattern weft floats of flat gilt animal substrate, pattern repeat 9.9 x 4.4 cm, Perugia, S. Domenico (Monnas, Merchants, Princes, and Painters, 74, fig. 67).

Figure 4.18 Textile with Floral Design, two sections. Lampas. Top: Warp 12.1 cm; weft 18.2 cm. Bottom: Warp: 5 cm; weft approx. 19.3 cm. Central Asia, Mongol period, c. late 13th-mid-14th century. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York. Rogers Fund, 1919 (top: 19.191.3); Fletcher Fund, 1946 (bottom: 46.156.22) (Metropolitan Museum of Art Online Collection).

Figure 4.19 Textile with Tiny Leaves. Tabby with supplementary weft. Warp: 14.5 cm; weft: 15.5 cm, Central Asia, Mongol period, late 13th – mid 14th century. The Cleveland Museum of Art. The Dudley P. Allen Fund 1985.33 (Photo by Eiren Shea).

Figure 4.20 Detail of Bijan in bonds before Afrasiyab, from the Shahnama. Iran, Ilkhanid Period (early 14th century). Ink, opaque watercolor, gold and silver on paper. H: 9.2 cm; W: 11.5. Freer Gallery of Art and Sackler Gallery, F1940.13. (Smithsonian Learning Lab website: https://learninglab.si.edu/resources/view/41709).


Figure 4.22 Frontispiece, Discorides MS, Materia Medica, dated 1229. Topkapi Saray Museum, Istanbul, Ahmet III, 2127, fol. 2A (Golombek, “Draped Universe of Islam,” Fig. 4).

Figure 4.23 Detail of textile with stripes and inscriptions from the tomb of Alfonso de la Cerda (d. 1333). Lampas weave with areas of compound weave, silk, and gold thread. Burgos, Monasterio de las Huelgas, Museeo de Telas y Preseas, 46 (Wardwell, Panni Tartarici, fig. 13).

Figure 4.24 Detail of textile “A,” from the tomb of Can Grande della Scala (d. 1329). Lampas weave, with areas of compound weave, silk, and gold thread. Verona, Museuo di Castelvecchio (Wardwell, Panni Tartarici, Plate VIII A).
Figure 4.25 Striped textile, Ilkhanid period, Iran, 14th century. Lampas weave (satin and tabby), silk and gold thread. Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Kunstgewerbemuseum, 1875.259 (Legacy of Genghis Khan, fig. 196).

Figure 4.26 Textile fragment (Pattern woven silk). Central Asia or Iran (possibly), 1250-1350. Arabic text. L: 30.5 cm; W: 10 cm. Victoria and Albert Museum, no. 783-1875 (Clothworkers Center website: http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O137595/textile-fragment-unknown/).

Figure 4.27 Detail of a dalmatic. Lampas weave, silk and gold thread. Ilkhanid period (14th century). Lübeck, Marienkirche, M-111 (Wardwell, Panni Tartarici, fig. 41).

Figure 4.28 Detail of a chasuble. Lampas weave with areas of compound weave, silk and gold thread. Ilkhanid period (14th century). Lübeck, Marienkirche, M-32 (Wardwell, Panni Tartarici, fig. 42).

Figure 4.29 Detail of a dalmatic. Lampas weave, silk and gold thread. Ilkhanid period (14th century). Alte Kapelle, Regensburg (Wardwell, Panni Tartarici, fig. 5).

Figure 4.30 Fragment of a dalmatic, pattern woven silk with gold gilded tanned leather. Mongol period, c. 1300-1350. Central Asia or China. From a dalmatic, Alte Kapelle vestments, Diozensanmuseum, Regensburg Victoria and Albert Museum 8288-1863. (Clothworkers Center website: http://www.vam.ac.uk/collections/textiles/index.html).

Figure 4.31 Embroidered tirāz inscription in gold from a qasab fragment. Linen tabby weave. Egypt, 11th century. Royal Ontario Museum, 963-95-14 (photo by Eiren Shea).

Figure 4.32 The Prophet Muhammad receiving the submission of the Banu ’l-Nadir, folio 72a, Jami ’al-tawarikh, 1306-1307 CE (AH 706), Iran. Khalili Collection, London (Blair, Compendium of Chronicles, fig. 16).

Figure 4.33 Mahmūd of Ghazna donning a robe from the Caliph al-Qahir, 389/999, Jami’ al-tawarikh, 1306-1307 CE (AH 706), Iran. Edinburgh University Library, Or. MS.20, fol. 121r. (“Digital Book” of Rashid-al Din’s history, University of Edinburgh: http://images.is.ed.ac.uk/luna/servlet/media/book/showBook/UoEsha~4~4~64742~103064)

Figure 4.34 Enthronement of Shah Zav from the Shahnama. Iran, Tabriz, Ilkhanid period, c. 1330-1340. Ink, opaque watercolor, and gold on paper. H: 59.1, W: 40 cm. Sackler Gallery, S1989.107 (Smithsonian Learning Lab website: https://learninglab.si.edu/resources/view/456031).

Figure 4.35 Iskandar at the Talking Tree, from the Shahnama. Iran, Tabriz, Ilkhanid period c.1330-1336. Opaque watercolor, ink, and gold on paper. Purchase, Freer Gallery
of Art F1935.23 (Freer-Sackler website: 

Figure 5.1 “Baysunghur ibn Shahrukh Seateed in a Garden.” Kalila u Dimna of Nizamuddin. Abu’l-Ma’ali Nasrullah, Heart. Finished in 1429 CE/AH Muharram 833 (Timur and the Princely Vision, 110, cat. 21).

Figure 5.2 Giotto (c.1266/67-1337). Detail of Mongol horsemen from the Stefaneschi Polyptych with predella, painting. Commissioned by Cardinal Jacopo Stefaneschi c. 1313. Pinacoteca Vaticana, Rome (ARTSTOR).

Figure 5.3 Giotto (c.1266/67-1337). Detail of Cloth of Christ from Crucifixion. Fresco, 1305. Cappella degli Scrovegni nell'Arena, Padua, Italy (ARTSTOR).

Figure 5.4 Ambrogio Lorenzetti (c.1290-1348). Martyrdom of the Franciscans, c.1326, fresco. Chapter House, Basilica di San Francesco, Siena, Italy (ARTSTOR).

Figure 5.5 Giovanni del Biondo (act. c. 1356-1399). Detail of Martyrdom of Saint Sebastian with Scenes from His Life. painting, late 14th century. Opera di S. Maria del Fiore, Florence, Italy (ARTSTOR).

Figure 5.6 Giotto (c.1266/67-1337). Trial by Fire Before the Sultan of Egypt. Florence, S. Croce, Bardi Chapel (Hagioannu, “Giotto's Bardi Chapel Frescoes,” vol. 36, 1, 2001).

Figure 5.7 Simone Martini (1284-1344) and Lippo Memmi (c.1291-1356). Detail of Angel Gabriel from Annunciation with St. Ansanus and St. Maxima. Center of a triptych, signed and dated 1333, tempera on panel, 115 x 94 cm. Florence, Galleria degli Uffizi, triptych inv. nos 451-3 (ARTSTOR).

Figure 5.8 Tractatus de septem vitiiis. Illustration of Gluttony. Illuminated manuscript. Genoa, 14th century. Vellum. 17.1 x 15.8 cm. London, British Library, Department of Manuscripts, MS. Add. 27695, fol. 13 r.

Figure 5.9 Medallion, tapestry, silk and gilded lamella of animal substrate spun around cotton. Iraq or Western Iran, 1st half of the 14th century. Diam: 69 cm. David Collection, Copenhagen, 30/1995 (photo by Pernille Klemp).
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A Note on Transcriptions

For Chinese names and words, I follow the Pinyin transliteration system.

For Arabic and Persian names and words, I follow the *International Journal of Middle East Studies* (IJMES) translation and transliteration guide – diacritics are only added for words not found in the Merriam-Webster English dictionary, and not to personal names, place names, names of political parties and organizations, or titles of books and articles.

For Mongolian terms and proper nouns, I follow Thomas Allsen.
Introduction

This dissertation explores the emergence of a Mongol courtly visual culture through an analysis of court dress and cultural exchange between China and the West (Central Asia and Persia) during the Yuan dynasty (c. 1260-1368). It is the first systematic study of Mongol court dress that brings together evidence from surviving clothing, textiles, pictorial representations and textual descriptions. By considering all of this material together, it pushes past broad generalizations of Mongol dress and customs, namely that the Mongols wore fitted coats and slept in tents, to reconstruct some of the diversity of visual culture of the Mongol period. While art historians of the Yuan period most often study paintings made by Han literati painters, without considering artistic production outside of the cannon of Chinese art, here questions about the contributions of the Mongols to the broader visual landscape of China are brought into relief. This thesis attempts to illuminate the period as a turning point in the arts of China beyond China and beyond painting.

Costume is one of the clearest ways of projecting a desired identity. It may express wealth and power via rare or expensive textiles, assert political dominance through symbolic ornamentation, or associate with a culture or cultures by adopting particular dress elements. As such, a study of actual and pictorially represented fashion of a ruling elite, alongside sumptuary regulations, can reveal much about political and cultural aspirations. The subject of court dress in the Yuan dynasty is particularly

1 This dissertation is limited to court dress in the Yuan and the Ilkhanate due to a lack of surviving material in the Golden Horde and the Chagatai Khanates.
interesting as the Mongols were able to draw from a variety of sources in the aesthetic expressions of their identity as rulers of China in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. In addition, the ways that Mongols were often represented pictorially by other peoples reveals much about the image of and anxiety about Mongols as well as the efficacy of the dissemination of the Mongol image during their period of rule in Eurasia, especially in view of how quickly they rose to power.

Beginning in the early thirteenth century, the Mongols, a coalition of peoples from the steppe region north of China, united under Chinggis Khan, and managed to conquer huge areas of the Eurasian continent from China to Hungary. Scholarship into the twenty-first century has often adhered to the view that Mongol artistic patronage and taste were “influenced” by other, better-established cultures. In China this takes the form of seeing the Mongol period as moving towards increased “sinicization.” This view is simplistic, at best, and implies that art produced under Mongolian rule was in essence derivative, or only worthy of study when situated in the rubric of Chinese art. In the last fifteen years there has been a modest surge in attempts to reexamine the role of Mongol agency in many aspects of their civilization, although the role of dress and other arts in the formation of a Mongol identity has yet to be fully examined in this regard. This dissertation defines, categorizes, and contextualizes Mongol court dress and textiles. In so doing, it also shows how the Mongol elite constructed a political and cultural identity for themselves through dress and other material culture, and how this identity was translated pictorially in representations of Mongols by other Eurasian civilizations.
Mongol Textiles in Context

Mongol visual culture is not well-studied in the field of Chinese art history. The scholarly interest in this period shown to literati-style painting (wenren hua 文人畫), continues to fit more easily into the Chinese art canon than other media created during the Yuan dynasty. That said, Yuan literati painting is often approached either as a sort of protest art created within the trope of the “recluse at court” (chaoyin 朝隱), or as the traitorous works of disloyal Chinese who served the Mongols. This is not entirely surprising as the Mongols kept less extensive and less well-known written records of themselves, and the historical record has a pejorative outlook on Mongol rule in both China and Persia. Indeed, it has only been in the last twenty years that historians have become interested in the Mongols and other nomadic groups independent of an exterior cultural standard (usually that of China or Persia); art historians have followed suit.

The distinctive, often hybrid character of artistic production of the Mongol period, however, was first remarked upon by art historians in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. The impact of cultural exchanges between between China, Central Asia, and Europe was first noticed in the patterns, production, and widespread

---

Zhao Mengfu is the best-studied example of an artist whose work was neglected by the traditional cannon until the twentieth century for his role as a bureaucrat under the Mongols. See Chu-Tsing Li, “Recent Studies on Zhao Mengfu’s Painting in China.” Artibus Asiae, vol. 53, No. 1/2 (1993), 195.
3 In addition, Mongol achievements in China are often seen as evidence of increased “sinicization.” See for example Herbert Franke, “From Tribal Chieftain to Universal Emperor and God: The Legitimation of the Yuan Dynasty,” in China Under Mongol Rule (Aldershot and Brookfield, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 1994), IV, 8. The problems with the concept of sinicization are discussed in Chapter 1 of this dissertation.
distribution of thirteenth and fourteenth century “Tartar,” or Mongol, textiles. In Paget Toynbee’s “Tartar cloths,” from 1900, Toynbee points out references to textiles manufactured under Mongol rule in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries in relatively contemporary European literary works by Dante, Boccaccio, and Chaucer. In most articles and essays on the subject in the first half of the twentieth century, textiles produced in Mongol lands seem only to interest scholars as evidence of the burgeoning fascination with the exotic and the East present in late Medieval and Renaissance Europe. Beginning in the second half of the twentieth century, art historians such as Basil Gray made progress toward examining Mongol art as a unique hybrid, and in many ways laid the groundwork for subsequent studies of artistic exchange between the Yuan and the Ilkhanate. However, in these studies Ilkhanid art is inevitably viewed through the lens of the sedentary civilizations surrounding it, including Persia, Byzantium, and China, not on its own terms. In addition, art produced in the Yuan dynasty is either left out entirely (with the exception of literati painting) or absorbed under the general label of “Chinese art.” The artistic interactions between the Mongol courts are therefore obscured, and Ilkhanid and Yuan innovations seen as offshoots of the traditions of Persia, Byzantium, or China. Basil Gray’s main academic specialty was Islamic art, which explains his grouping together of Yuan Mongol art under the umbrella of Chinese art more generally. Only in some recent exhibitions and publications is Yuan Mongol art both treated autonomously from Chinese art, as well as contextualized in relation to the arts of other
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nomadic or semi-nomadic steppe groups who ruled large swaths of China, such as the Khitan and the Jurchen.\(^6\)

**Eurasian Exchange**

The thirteenth and fourteenth centuries saw a period of unparalleled exchange – commercial, cultural, diplomatic – across Eurasia. This was in large part due to the Mongol conquests that reached, at their peak, to Liegnitz (Poland) in the West, and as far as the Korean peninsula in the East. As Janet Abu-Lughod has shown, Mongol power was not uniformly hegemonic but rather concentrated in various cities and towns across Asia and Europe.\(^7\) Factors distinctive to the period such as the geographical range of Mongol power, the mass resettling of artisans, the desire of merchants across Asia to find new trading partners, and the newfound interest by European religious and mercantile communities in the East, combined to create the possibilities that would give way to economic and cultural exchange on an unprecedented level during this period.

It is telling that the subject of cultural exchange in the Mongol period has been most thoroughly treated not by art historians, but by the historian Thomas Allsen in his 1997 book *Commodity and Exchange in the Mongol Empire*. In it, Allsen discusses the import of textiles, especially those woven with gold, in the Mongol world of the


thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Allsen consults a variety of sources in this holistic approach to cultural interactions within the Mongol empire, though the evidence he uses is principally textual and the book has no illustrations. *Commodity and Exchange* is therefore best read in conjunction with an exhibition catalogue published the same year, *When Silk Was Gold*, edited by James Watt and Anne Wardwell and including a number of important textiles from the collections of the Cleveland Museum of Art and the Metropolitan Museum of Art. The scope of *When Silk Was Gold* is chronologically wider than *Commodity and Exchange*, with textiles from the Tang, Liao, Song, Jin, and Yuan dynasties, as well as those produced in Central Asia during the seventh through fourteenth centuries. Textiles are used as illustrations of trade and gifting across the overland routes known popularly as the Silk Road. These two publications necessarily form the basis of any contemporary research on the subject of textiles in Eurasia during the Mongol period. While Allsen introduces most of the key primary sources on the topic, *When Silk Was Gold* provides a wealth of material evidence. These studies provide the broad groundwork for this dissertation, but due to its scope, both chronologically and geographically, reviews of the literature specific to each section of the dissertation are found at the beginning of each chapter.

**Gifting, Dress, and Political Power**

A central theme of this study is the use of textiles and dress in symbolic expressions of political power. Both what the khans and the Mongol nobility actually wore and how they were represented are key issues considered here. The way in which
royalty is represented plays a role in making power tangible. Here, pictorial representations of dress, and excavated dress, worn by the Mongol court are studied as manifestations of this desire to express power. Khans and their officials were portrayed in court paintings, in illuminated manuscripts, in stone sculptures, and in tomb murals. These representations are not only icons of power, but also help us understand the form and use of court dress. The role of gifting and robing at the Mongol court, a central act, is approached as one of the most important uses of textiles for the Mongols, and the varying manifestations of robing and gifting of cloth at both the Yuan and Ilkhanid courts will be considered in detail.

Mongol khans were represented in a variety of ways, in a range of media, throughout the empire and at different periods, in contrast to the strict iconography followed in other societies – coins featuring profiles of Roman emperors, or the stone reliefs at Taq-i Bustan of Sasanian kings, for example. Isabelle Charleux has studied the role of portrait statues of khans in ancestor worship beginning in the thirteenth century and continuing through the fifteenth century. In China, the surviving court portraits of khans are those by the Nepalese artist Anige which in contrast to the full-length portraits favored by Song emperors, are bust-length portraits, wearing Mongol hairstyles and

---


headgear. Khubilai Khan is also portrayed hunting in a court-commissioned hanging scroll by Liu Guandao, discussed in Chapter 3. In the Ilkhanate, surviving representations of khans are found in illuminated manuscripts where the khan is portrayed in courtly settings wearing Mongol dress. As we will see in Chapter 4, the Ilkhans co-opted the legacy of the Persian kings, portraying traditional heroes from the Persian national epic, the *Shahnama* (*Book of the Kings*), in the guise of Mongol khans. They also incorporated the story of their recent conquests into the broader history of the world in Rashid al-Din’s *Jami’ al-tawarikh* (*Compendium of Chronicles*). Despite the range in representation and potential interpretation, what is clear from at least the Yuan and Ilkhanid examples is the role that Mongol dress played in these representations. In these courts, the khan is never portrayed as a Chinese emperor or a Persian king, but rather he is put into the Chinese or Persian setting dressed in recognizably Mongol attire. The Mongol model, one that brings together various cultural attributes, but is nonetheless easily recognizable, is fitted onto these pre-existing societies.

But who was allowed to dress as a Mongol, and what did it signify? Dress does not appear to have been as strictly regulated at the Mongol courts as it had been in Song, Liao, or Jin China, or ‘Abbasid Baghdad, as we will see in Chapters 3 and 4. The general population was not forced to wear Mongol clothing, as would be the case in later centuries with Manchu clothing at the Qing (1644-1911) court in China. Sumptuary laws, too, differed at Mongol courts from those in China and the Islamic world. While the Chinese court followed a strict code regarding robe color and design, in the Mongol court officials dress was not distinguished based on official rank, at least initially, as is
discussed in detail in Chapters 2 and 3. Mongol court officials, however, were distinguished from the greater mass of the population through fine materials gifted to them by the khan such as silk, and most importantly, *nasīj*, lampas weave silk woven with a supplementary weft in gold thread. The gift of these textiles marked a bond between the khan and his officials both symbolically and politically.

Luxury textiles, especially silk, were long used in the pre-modern world to pay tribute or taxes, as diplomatic gifts, and even as a more general currency. Mongol use of textiles was distinct from that of other cloth-centric societies, including those in China and the Islamic world, for several reasons including volume produced, type of cloth produced, and the role of gifting. The sheer volume of cloth produced for court use certainly set the Yuan court apart from the preceding Song dynasty. This massive production for the court was due to Mongol rituals involving robing, wherein the khan would give multiple robes to thousands of his officials. These practices are discussed in Chapter 3. Related to the volume of robes made for the court was the quantity of gold textiles produced for use by the Mongol court. Although gold thread was used in the clothing of prior dynasties, including the Liao, Jin, and Song, as well as throughout Central Asia and Persia, the type of cloth favored by the Mongol court, *nasīj*, or cloth
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with an all-over pattern in gold, meant that a much larger quantity of gold thread had to be produced for the court than ever before. Questions of production of nasīj in the pre-Yuan and Yuan periods are addressed in Chapters 2 and 3.

Relevant to the two above characteristics is the act of gifting of clothing in the Mongol courts. Gifting, as a means to create a social and political bond, is not unique to the Mongols. The use of robing, or of gifting pieces of the khan’s wardrobe, especially coats and belts, was a way of establishing a bond of service between the ruler and his subjects, as is outlined in both Chapters 2 and 3. The granting of a piece of clothing actually worn by the ruler to a subject was practiced in many places across Europe and Asia, as Thomas Allsen has shown. In most pre-modern societies bathing was practiced irregularly, meaning clothing worn would be imbued with the scent of the wearer. Particular to Turkic peoples of the Steppe, including Mongols, was the taboo against using water to bathe, and the prohibition of bathing, which would result in more strongly scented clothes. In the Mongol context, it appears that the scent of the individual was intimately connected to the aura or soul of the person, so that a piece of clothing that was worn by an individual would in fact possess a part of the wearer, and could be transmitted to another person through the donning of a robe, for example. We understand, then, the
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13 Allsen, *Commodity and Exchange*, 89.
14 Allsen, *Commodity and Exchange*, 90.
weighty significance of the gifting of a previously worn robe between the ruler and his subjects in this context.

In the Mongol model, as with gifting elsewhere, these clothing items and objects of adornment were not given freely, and the receiver of the gift was expected to reciprocate with a promise of loyalty and service to the ruler.\textsuperscript{15} The central role played by the granting of clothing from the ruler to his men in the Mongol context was, however, as symbolic as it was essential. The Mongol system of organization of armies was based on a decimal system, from the ten men directly serving the ruler and moving outward to a tümen, or 10,000 men. The khuriltai, which decided officially who would be the next khaghan, or Great Khan, was nominally an election by the khans, in practice it was a bloody battle often lasting months or years. Thus, having the support of soldiers counted in groups of 10,000 was crucial for this bid to power. Therefore, the gift of the robe, and the mass robing of the tümen, as described later by Marco Polo at Khubilai’s court in the context of ceremonial banquets, was not simply a symbolic gesture, or one of practicality (outfitting the troops with uniforms), but key to the success of any would-be khan.

**Scope and Outline of the Dissertation**

This study brings together a wide variety of material produced between the 10\textsuperscript{th}-14\textsuperscript{th} centuries to reconstruct the vestimentary landscape of the period. Where possible, studies of the the dress of a given group begin with excavated examples of dress and textiles preserved in collections in China, Hong Kong, Europe, and the United States.

\textsuperscript{15} Mauss, *The Gift*, 4.
Other visual material considered includes representations of the figure in funerary art (tomb murals), and officially commissioned works of art including figure painting and illuminated manuscripts. Alongside this evidence, accounts by visitors to the Mongol court and historical documents on official dress regulations, the manufacture and exchange of textiles, and the institutional significance of dress are taken into consideration. A Chinese-English glossary of 10th-14th century dress and textile terms, along with Persian-English and Arabic-English glossaries have also been included.

The first chapter of the dissertation, “The Steppe and the Central Plain: Uighur, Khitan, Jurchen, and Tangut Dress” surveys some of the potential precursors of Mongol court dress. Sections are devoted to Uighur, Khitan (Liao), Jurchen (Jin), and Tangut dress, with some discussion of Song dynasty court fashion. The clothing of these peoples has not been studied in great detail, and this chapter condenses the remaining material, in the form of paintings and excavated textiles alongside period texts to provide a systematized overview of what was worn in a courtly context between the 9th and 13th centuries. When available, overviews of particular weaves, and specific types of dress, alongside ceremonial use are also addressed.

The second chapter, “Early Mongol Dress (1206-1259),” turns to the early period of state formation (1206-1259), examining the material and textual evidence for what textiles and costumes the early Mongols were wearing, where these were being produced, and how they were codified. Through the compilation of excavated material and studying this material alongside Chinese and European texts, I make hypotheses regarding early
use of luxury textiles, including those woven with gold thread. Comparisons with similar textiles from the Liao and Jin dynasties illuminates how textiles were used in the first third of the Mongol Empire. This chapter lays the groundwork for the vestimentary systems that would emerge in the Yuan and Ilkhanid periods.

The third chapter, “Yuan Dynasty Court Dress (1260-1368),” outlines the textiles, costume, and associated ceremonies of the Yuan dynasty, relying on excavated dress, pictorial representations of members of the court, and descriptions, both by foreign visitors such as Marco Polo, and in official Chinese histories. By presenting a holistic view of the form and function of Yuan court dress, it highlights contrasts with preceding models, and allows for some contrast with the other parts of the Mongol Empire. Types of textiles, as well as the form of male and female dress are categorized so that some idea of the diversity of the Yuan court dress system, and contrast with the Chinese textual record, are revealed. The last part of the chapter looks at the use of textiles at the Yuan court, specifically jisün/zhisun/zhama banquets and the central role of robing within it.

The fourth chapter, “Ilkhanid Court Dress (1259-1353)” considers the Middle Eastern end of the Mongol Empire with an attempt to define Ilkhanid court dress, a subject complicated by the lack of archaeological material. This chapter brings together illuminated manuscripts showing court dress, textual descriptions of dress and textiles, and textiles preserved in European church repositories and tombs likely dating from the Ilkhanid period. Hypotheses are suggested for types of fabric and tailoring found in Ilkhanid court dress, and some conclusions are drawn about to their relation to politics and ceremonies.
Chapter 1: The Steppe and the Central Plain: Uighur, Khitan, Jurchen, and Tangut Dress

The Mongols were not the first foreign group to conquer parts of China; non-Han groups, especially those from the steppe north and west controlled parts of what is now considered China from the earliest periods of state formation.16 The Mongols were directly preceded by the Khitans who formed the Liao dynasty (c. 906-1125), and the Jurchen, who formed the Jin dynasty (c. 1115-1234). However, while the Liao and Jin shared rule over parts of China with the Song dynasty, the Mongols (or Yuan) conquered all of Song territory, along with most of the surrounding areas. In establishing rule over China and the surrounding regions, the Yuan benefited from the examples set forth for them by the Liao, the Jin, and the Song. The incorporation of Tangut (Xixia), by force, and Uighur territories, by capitulation, into the Mongol Empire also impacted aspects of Yuan rule. Therefore, to understand the Mongol dress system, which was able to form and flourish in such a short period of time after the initial conquests, it is helpful to look to precedents set by these earlier ruling polities.17

The choice to focus on the clothing of non-“Han” groups, with Tang and Song clothing taking a secondary position, stems from the Sinocentrism that even in recent decades continues to characterize studies on dress and art of each of these groups,
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17 The importance of approaching the art and cultures of the Uighurs, Khitan, Jurchen, and Tanguts in a more comprehensive way is beginning to be undertaken by art historians. See for example, Susan Huang’s study of Tangut frontispieces on Buddhist sutras: Susan Huang, “Reassessing Printed Buddhist Frontispieces from Xi Xia,” Zhejiang University Journal of Art and Archaeology 1 (2014), 129-182.
including the Mongols. Too often, studies of the art of Uighurs, Khitan, Jurchen, Tangut, and Mongols is approached through a teleological rubric of “sinicization,” as if the more “Chinese” elements discernable in the art and dress of these people, the better. The term sinicization is inherently problematic, as it suggests an inevitable absorption of non-Chinese cultures by a superior, monolithic Chinese culture. That one culture can be intrinsically deemed superior to another is problematic, and the idea that Chinese culture is monolithic is to misunderstand Chinese history. This term is nonetheless still too frequently used or implied, especially in discussions of Liao, Jin, and Yuan art and culture. It is one of my goals, in my study of the dress of these non-Han peoples, to overturn the outdated assumptions that these cultures could not resist the pull of Chinese culture – rather, I believe that “Chinese” aspects that were absorbed by each of them were the result of a sophisticated manipulation of an artistic vocabulary and system of

---


A more blatant example is found by Hong Zaixin and Cao Yiqiang in a chapter that attempts to evaluate a painting produced at the Mongol court in its institutional context. In it, they discuss the role of artistic patronage in legitimating the rule of Khubilai Khan: “One of the questions he faced was how to achieve a delicate balance between the highly civilized culture of China and the relatively primitive culture of the Mongols and other people of the western regions. On the one hand, he had to preserve the nomadic customs and ethnic identities of each group; on the other hand, if he expected to be venerated as the legitimate ruler of China, he could not appear as a ‘barbarian.’ Consequently, every cultural and artistic choice he made inevitably involved significant political implications.” Hong Zaixin with Cao Yiqiang, “Pictorial Representation and Mongol Institutions in Khubilai Khan Hunting,” In Liu and Ching (eds). *Arts of the Sung and Yüan: Ritual, Ethnicity, and Style in Painting* (1999), 193-194.

Sinocentrism is often more discreet, for example, when discussing Yuan art and dress as part of a larger Chinese tradition without taking into account Steppe and Central Asian characteristics. See for example, Gong Yuanjun and Huang Lijun, “Longhua Gezidong Yuandai Jiaocang Cixiu Nangdai de Yishu Tese” (隆化鸽子洞元代窖藏刺绣囊袋艺术特色 Art Characteristics of Yuan Dynasty’s Cache Embroidered Bags Unearthed at Longhua Gezidong) in Sun Huijun 孙慧君(ed.), *Longhua gezidong yuan dai jiaocang 隆化鸽子洞元代窖藏 (The Cache of Yuan Dynasty Unearthed at Longhua Gezidong)* (Hebei: Hebei People’s Publishing House, 2010), 154.
signification whose meaning was very much understood and used to express notions of power and cultural parity with China. The impact of China should not be cast aside completely, but when approaching non-“Han” groups our focus should be turned towards what was happening culturally to the north and the west of Tang and Song China, and how these cultures interacted with each other.

Chinese standard histories sometimes provide descriptions of dress based on texts relatively contemporaneous to the dress they describe. As we shall see, however, their usefulness only goes so far. Many of the descriptions of the dress of “Han” Chinese dynasties, as well as that of the Liao, Jin, and Yuan, are repetitive and generalized. We must be careful to not take descriptions of non-“Han” dress in the Chinese official histories at face value, since many of them are either suspiciously similar to generic descriptions of Chinese court dress or generalized descriptions of “barbarian” clothing. In other words, there is an adherence to certain tropes within the official histories. However, these histories provide a point of departure for a study of dress in and around China in this period. Usually there is at least one juan (卷 “scroll”) in a standard history devoted to descriptions of court dress. For the costume under consideration here, these descriptions are much shorter than for the Tang and Song dynasties. For example, the Liao shi (遼史 “History of the Liao Dynasty”) only has a six-page-long juan (juan 56) devoted to the

---

19 “Han” is a problematic term, but will be used here to refer to the Chinese dynasties, as this is the term used in the historical sources. As Mark Elliott points out, “the historical use of the term Han is highly unstable, and even in the contemporary world the term can be slippery. Sometimes it is used synonymously with “Chinese,” sometimes not; people who might be considered Han in some contexts might not be in others…” Elliott address the term and its implications in Mark Elliott, “Hushuo: The Northern Other and the Naming of the Han Chinese.” in Thomas S. Mullaney et al., Critical Han Studies: The History, Representation, and Identity of China’s Majority (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012), 173-190.
description of court dress, while the Song shi (宋史 “History of the Song dynasty”) provides six juan on costume (juan 149-154), totaling 123 pages. In addition to sections in the official histories specifically devoted to dress, information about court dress may be contained in other juan of the official histories such as biographies of emperors. We find this, for example, when clothing regulations have been implemented during the tenure of a specific emperor. In other words, the amount of information available to us on court dress from official histories of the tenth to fourteenth centuries in China is variable, ranging from paltry to overwhelming, depending on the passage in question. For the most part, I have based my descriptions on those juan related to court dress more generally. Systematic descriptions of Uighur and Tangut dress, on the other hand, are harder to come by. The Tangut kingdom and its customs, including dress, are described in the Song shi. The Revised and Newly Endorsed Law Codes of the Tiansheng Reign (Tiansheng gaijiu xinding lüling 天盛改旧新定律令) also gives us some clues about what was worn. For the Uighur and Tangut sections in general, I rely heavily on pictorial material.

Archaeologically excavated or otherwise preserved textiles, pictorial representations of dress, and textual descriptions of costume, even when taken in conjunction with each other, present an incomplete picture of the variety of dress that actually existed and was worn in a courtly setting between the tenth and fourteenth

---

20 For example, we read about dress regulations in Shengzong’s (r. 982-1031 CE) biography: regarding official dress in LS, juan 10, 110, and modifications in rules about the dress of the imperial family in LS, juan 17, 197.
21 I take the English translation of this title from Susan Huang. See Susan Huang, “Reassessing Printed Buddhist Frontispieces from Xi Xia,” 136.
centuries in China, Central Asia, and the steppe region. The archaeological record is problematic because excavated textiles are often found in a funerary context. This means we cannot know for certain if the textile buried with the corpses of the elite were in fact actually worn by the elite in life, or specially made for burial purposes. The other way textiles from this period are preserved is in monasteries and churches, and we might question whether these pieces reflected what was worn at the time as well. The pictorial and textual record gives us both an idealized and generalized portrayal of dress. A donor may have wished to be depicted wearing something special or even exotic, just as a Chinese bureaucrat helping to assemble materials on what was worn at the Liao or Jin court may have only relied on documents written by Chinese officials describing the dress. These in turn might be descriptions that either use misleading Chinese vocabulary for totally different types of clothing. The officials compiling the dynastic histories also may have turned to established vocabularies of what was worn at the Chinese court to help give a sense of majesty and authority to these non-Han dynasties. This is not to say that the archaeological, pictorial, and textual record is fantasy, just that not everything we read or see should be taken as absolute truth. We should keep these problems in mind, but recognize that if we want to understand anything about tenth to fourteenth century dress these are the sources we must rely on, and work to find where the archaeological, pictorial, and official and non-official textual record intersect to help fill in the pieces of what was worn by non-Han elites during these centuries.

I. Uighur Dress
The Uighurs were a Turkic people who moved out of present-day Mongolia and settled in oasis towns of the Tarim Basin beginning in the mid-ninth century (fig. 1.1). Unlike the Liao and Jin, the Uighurs never ruled any part of what is generally considered China proper, which for simplicity’s sake we define as including areas ruled by the Tang and the Song (fig. 1.2). One result of this is that there is no official Chinese history written about the Uighur kingdom, and therefore no systematic description of court dress for the period under consideration (ninth-twelfth centuries). We will reconstruct possible court dress therefore based on pictorial and material, rather than textual, evidence. Uighur culture had an impact on the Mongols from the very beginning of the Mongol Empire. The Uighurs submitted early to Chinggis Khan, in 1209, a mere three years after the Mongols had confederated, and played a key role in helping the Mongols to establish their empire. Thereafter, certain aspects of Uighur culture made a substantial impact at the courts of both Chinggis and Ögödei Khan, and Uighur advisors would be employed throughout the Yuan dynasty.

---


The Uighurs may also have worn garb similar to that associated with a major Mongol ceremonial banquet, a robe called in Mongolian the *jisün* (Chinese: *zhisun* or *只孫*), and some scholars have argued that they are responsible for transmitting *kesi* (繡絲), or “cut” silk tapestry technology to the Mongols.\(^{25}\) *Jisün*, which will be discussed further in the third chapter, were robes of a single color worn by all the officials of the court and by the Khan himself at major Mongol court ceremonies and banquets, such as the Khan’s birthday. Thomas Allsen proposes that Yuan *jisün* were derived from a West Asian model transmitted to the Mongols via the Uighurs.\(^{26}\) Allsen cites the fact that the first mention of *jisün* robes is directly after the Uighur submission to the Mongols in 1209, and that the Uighurs had a system of designating specific colors to zodiac signs, which may have some bearing on the monochrome character of the robes.\(^{27}\)

The origins of *kesi*, sometimes translated as Chinese silk tapestry or silk pictorial tapestry,\(^{28}\) are difficult to define. While James Watt and Anne Wardwell hypothesize that Uighurs were responsible for its introduction to both the Song and Khitan, who in turn likely transmitted it to the Mongols,\(^{29}\) archaeological evidence points to the production of *kesi* in China as early as the third century BCE.\(^{30}\) *Kesi* is characterized by small slits in

---

\(^{25}\) *WSWG*, 61-62.

\(^{26}\) Allsen, *Commodity and Exchange*, 77-78.

\(^{27}\) Allsen, *Commodity and Exchange*, 77-78.


\(^{29}\) *WSWG*, 61-62.

\(^{30}\) Sheng, “Chinese Silk Tapestry,” 70.
the fabric in the direction of the warp where the pattern changes color. As Angela Sheng explains, “the weaver “colors” in a small area of the weft by taking one thread of one color, wound around a small bobbin-like shuttle, back and forth latitudinally over the warp. When that area is done, he goes on to the adjacent area using another thread of a second color and proceeds likewise until the desired motif is achieved…where the color areas of the pattern meet, a slit is visible.” Several different types of *kesi* have been identified for the period under consideration, and they were produced by the Northern Song, Uighurs, Tanguts, Jin and Yuan, in addition to Central Asian groups.32

From the ninth to twelfth centuries the Uighur kingdom with one of its capitals at Beshbalik, known in the Chinese sources as Beiting (北庭), at the foot of the Tianshan mountains in present-day Xinjiang Province was an important presence among the oasis communities of the Tarim Basin.33 Avid patrons of first Manichaeism34 and then Buddhism, the bulk of surviving medieval Uighur culture takes the form of religious art,

---

31 Sheng, “Chinese Silk Tapestry,” 70.
32 Wardwell and Watt, *WSWG*, 53. Zhao Feng defines *kesi* as “Silk tapestry: woven with the technique where one set of warp ends is woven with discontinuous weft lats of different colours in tabby weave…The technique originated from wool tapestry, which was adapted to silk in China in the Tang dynasty first by the Uyghurs, and became popular in the Song dynasty.” See Zhao Feng, *Treasures in Silk*, 337. Krishna Riboud defines *kesi* as “tapestry weave with warp and silk and weft in either silk or metal thread,” citing the *Zhongguo da baikequandshu fangzhi* (*The Great Encyclopedia of China Volume on Textile*), Beijing: 1984, 158 in “A brief account of textiles excavated in the Liao dynasty (907-1125) tombs in China,” *CIETA Bulletin* 74, 1997, 44.
33 Though the capital of the Uighurs after c. 840 is often cited as Gaochang, Abe Takeo argues persuasively, citing contemporary Chinese sources, that the capital was in fact Beshbalik. See Abe, Takeo. “Where was the Capital of the Western Uighurs?” in *Silver Jubilee Volume of the Zinbun-Kagaku-Kenyusyo, Kyoto University* (Kyoto: Nissha Printing Co., Ltd., 1954), 436. See also Colin Mackerras, *The Uighur Empire according to the Tang dynastic histories: a study in Sino-Uighur relations*, 744-840 (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1973), 10-12; Michael Robert Drompp, *Tang China and the Collapse of the Uighur Empire: A Documentary History* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 7-8.
34 Mackerras, *The Uighur Empire*, 9.
and indeed depictions of donors provide some of the only pictorial evidence for Uighur dress of the period. This in itself is problematic as we have no way of knowing if such pictorial representations reflected actual costumes worn by the Uighurs. Therefore, although these paintings will be analyzed and categorized in this section, we must keep in mind that they are related to costume and to the public image that upper class donors wished to project, but are not a replacement for the thing itself, as we shall see when comparing the pictorial material to two excavated robes.

Uighur official relations and exchange with China began in the Tang dynasty, first from their kingdom in present-day Mongolia, which fell around 840 CE, then from centers further west in the northwest Gansu corridor and northern Tarim Basin. Indeed, intermarriage between the Tang Chinese court and Uighur ruling class was a standard diplomatic practice. Although they borrowed elements from Tang China, the Uighurs preserved their own style of dress, expecting Chinese ladies who married into the royal family to adopt Uighur dress and customs. Although interaction with China was regular, and the Uighurs were to an extent familiar with Northern Chinese culture, Uighur art and

35 For a detailed study of Sino-Uighur relations during the Tang dynasty see Mackerras, *The Uighur Empire*, especially 14-50.
36 We are presently only considering the art and culture of the Uighur state established in the Tarim Basin which had its centers in Kocho and Beshbalik, where diplomatic relations with China were reestablished in 856. The Gansu area reestablished official diplomatic ties with the Tang court in 924, and came under Tangut control by 1028; much less is known about the artistic production of this territory. See Drompp, *Tang China and the Collapse of the Uighur Empire*, 197-198.
38 Russell-Smith, *Uygur patronage in Dunhuang*, 26, 37.
culture remained quite separate from that of their eastern neighbors, and more clearly connected to Central Asia and other Turkic groups than to the Chinese.

Scholarship

The best evidence for Uighur dress are two robes (figs. 1.3, 1.4) unearthed in 1951 in Alar (Chinese: Ala’er 阿拉爾) in present-day Xinjiang Province dating to the Northern Song dynasty (c. 1131-1162). These are woven with large roundels with animal patterns and were designated Uighur dress by the textile historians Zhao Feng, Wang Le, and Wang Mingfang.39 A robe in the Chris Hall Collection, currently on loan to the Museum of Asian Civilizations in Singapore, could be a third example of Uighur dress, but based on its design is more likely Tangut (fig. 1.5).

In addition to these three examples, Buddhist paintings, while intended for a specific religious context, provide pictorial evidence for how Uighur donors wished to be portrayed. From these paintings we can, at least, understand something of how the Uighur elite wished to represent themselves in a Buddhist context. In addition, these paintings formed the basis of prior studies of Uighur dress. The paintings are found in several locations including the Mogao caves in Dunhuang in present-day Gansu province, the ancient city of Gaochang, in Turfan, Xinjiang province, and Buddhist cave temples of Bezeklik, also near Turfan. The largest number of surviving portrayals are found at Bezeklik. These were first studied by Albert Von le Coq in his 1913 Chotscho and

39 Zhao Feng, Wang Le, and Wang Mingfang, “Study on Two Brocade Robes Unearthed in Ala’er Basin, Qinghai” (论青海阿拉尔出土的两件锦袍), Wenwu (文物, Cultural Relics) (no. 8, 2008), 66-73.
subsequently in his multivolume *Die Buddhistische Spätantike in Mittelasien* (1922-1933).\footnote{Albert von Le Coq, *Chotscho*, Facsimile-Wiedergaben der wichtigeren Funde der Ersten Königlich Preussischen Expedition nach Turfan in Ost-Turkistan (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer 1913); Albert von Le Coq, *Die Buddhistische Spätantike in Mittelasien*, vol. 3 (Berlin: Reimer, 1922-1933).} Since then, they have been studied in Chinese publications such as *Tulufan Bozikelike shiku* (吐鲁番柏孜克里克石窟) (1990), and in detail by both Lilla Russell-Smith in her study of Uighur artistic patronage and production, *Uygur Patronage in Dunhuang: Regional Art Centres on the Northern Silk Road in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries* (2005) and Anne Marie von Gabain in her comprehensive study of Uighur culture and history, *Das Leben im uigurischen Königreich von Qoco (850-1250)* (1973).\footnote{Annemarie von Gabain, *Das Leben im uigurischen Königreich von Qoco - (850-1250)* (Harrassowitz [in Komm.], Wiesbaden, 1973).}

Russell-Smith discusses costume briefly in her study, but her main focus is on artistic patronage and the development of Uighur painting.\footnote{See Russell-Smith, *Uygur patronage in Dunhuang*, 23-30.} Von Gabain devotes a chapter to the topic, dividing non-monastic Uighur dress into ten categories: categories one through five describe male dress, while six through ten focus on female dress. There is a substantial amount of overlap in the dress of these categories, however, and von Gabain includes dress that may not have been worn by Uighurs themselves but by neighboring Turkic groups, which, while certainly related, can be confusing. In addition, von Gabain’s approach is not art historical, nor does she take excavated examples into consideration, as these had not been unearthed until decades after the publication of her book.
Excavated Examples

The two silk robes from Alar, both with large roundels, were excavated in what was Uighur territory in the 11th century. As we will see, they are different from the robes worn by donors in terms of textile design and cut. Rather, they appear to be closer to a Central Asian tradition, exemplified by Sasanian and Sogdian dress (which will be discussed in greater detail below), with one robe featuring four birds in pearl roundels and the other confronted sheep and peacocks. Both have high collars and narrow sleeves, the collars close to the right in a shallow V-neck. The authors call the robes “Central Asian brocades,” which is very unspecific. According to the analysis of the materials, both robes appear to be woven of samite, that is, weft-faced compound twill, and flare outward in the skirt portion with a slit in the back to facilitate movement. The robe with the peacocks and confronted sheep cinches at the waist. In their analysis of the robes’ weave structures and patterns, Zhao Feng, Wang Le, and Wang Mingfang draw attention to the legacy of the use of floral roundel patterns in the Tang dynasty, and make comparisons with Liao and Northern Song robes. They assert that the use of samite comes out of a Central Asian weaving tradition, and that the pattern of the birds in

---

43 For a full analysis of the weave and structure of the robes, see Zhao Feng, Wang Le, and Wang Mingfang, “Study on Two Brocade Robes,” 66-73.
44 Both the English “brocade” and its Chinese equivalent jin 錦 are problematic, and indeed, avoided by textile historians because they are so vague. In English, if something is “brocaded” it is woven with a brocading weft, defined in the CIETA vocabulary (the standard in the study of textiles) as “an additional weft, introduced into a ground weave, the movement of which is limited to the width of the area where it is required, and which does not travel from selvage to selvage” (Vocabulary of Technical Terms, Lyon: Publications de CIETA (Edition March 2006), 15), but in historical documents “brocade” could refer to any textile with a woven pattern, “especially one with a pattern in gold or silver” (Vocabulary of Technical Terms, 15). Krishna Riboud also notes that “the Chinese use this term for a complex weave, without clarifying whether ornamentation is obtained by warp or by weft.” Riboud, “A brief account of textiles excavated in dated Liao dynasty (907-1125) tombs in China,” CIETA-Bulletin (74, 1997), 44.
roundels has some connection to silk patterns produced in the Byzantine Empire.\textsuperscript{46}

Regarding the robe with peacocks and confronted sheep, the authors point out that both tailoring and pattern of the robes do not seem to be related to Chinese style robes, but rather show Persian or Byzantine influence.\textsuperscript{47}

The silk robe in the Chris Hall collection, too, features a high collar, narrow sleeves, and a flaring skirt with a slit at the back. However, its pattern is of small roundels in flowers, and may therefore be more related to Tangut dress. It will be discussed in the Tangut section of this chapter.

\textbf{Pictorial Examples}

Painted depictions of Uighur dress can be broadly divided into two categories. These broad categorizations are inspired by von Gabain’s ten categories of Uighur dress which will be cited here as a sort of concordance. The first is a robe that closes in the front, usually with a high, rounded collar. The female variant of this has a v-neckline flanked by wide lapels. This first category includes von Gabain’s categories 1, 5, 6 and 10 (fig. 1.6). The second is a robe that closes on either the right or left side, which would include von Gabain’s categories 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9. These categories allow both for subdivisions into male and female dress as well as variations that include looser and tighter fitting robes, short and long sleeves, and ankle and knee length robes.

\textsuperscript{46} Zhao Feng, Wang Le, and Wang Mingfang, “Study on Two Brocade Robes,” 68.
An example of the front-closing style of robe is found in portrayals of donors in Bezeklik cave 20, presently in the collection of Museum für Asiatische Kunst in Berlin (fig. 1.7). The donors step forward on a floral patterned runner, or narrow carpet, their robes are red, each with a different repeat floral pattern, and all three wear a golden tiara-style headdress, hold a flower and hide their hands in their sleeves. The robes flow open to reveal black boots and green colored fabric lining the inside of the robe. A relatively high level of detail allows us to make out not only intricate patterns on the tiaras, but also small details on the belt and objects hanging from it. Disks, possibly of metal or jade, punctuate the belts, and the ends of the belt hang down the front of the robe.

According to Albert von le Coq’s reading of the text in the cartouche next to the first donor’s head (which he describes as “indistinct”), these donors are identified as “The Tutuq Bugra [from the lineage of] Sali,” a family who he notes “flourished in Kocho for a long time.” The tiaras worn by these high-ranking donors may have a connection to military as well as social status. Sören Stark posits a link between tiaras worn by Turkic leaders in the eighth century, that he calls “bird tiaras” and the *heguan* (鶡冠) “peacock cap/hat” worn by high-ranking Tang military officials, citing a Central Asian precedent.

---


49 *Heguan* were worn at least by the Han dynasty by military officials. The *Hou Han shu* describes them in the dress and regalia section, “The cap has a circular throat band without fringes, dark blue thread forming a band, and on top of this, peacock tail feathers, standing left and right to form the ‘Peasant cap.’” Translation by Carine Defoort in *The Pheasant Cap Master (He guan zi): A Rhetorical Reading* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997), 16. The most famous wearer of this type of Han *heguan* was the so-called Pheasant Cap Master (He guan zi), who is said to have lived prior to the Han dynasty in the late Springs and Autumns period (770-476 BCE) or the Warring States period (475-221 BCE). See Defoort, *The Pheasant Cap Master*, 14-16. By the Tang dynasty the *heguan* seems to have lost the pheasant feathers but retained the tall form.
conveyed by the Sogdians. Referring to the Turkic headgear as a “bird tiara” creates a linguistic link between Chinese and Turkic headgear that in fact did not exist. That is not to say that they did not share stylistic similarities. A look at a Tang dynasty ceramic figurine from the grave of Li Zhen (dating to 717 CE) wearing such a tiara indeed appears to relate in form to the Turkic, and specifically Uighur, versions of the tiara worn by the Bezeklik donors (fig. 1.8). We will also see a similar tiara on a portrayal of a Tangut emperor in the Tangut section of this chapter.

The female equivalent of the front-closing robe may be found in a portrayal of female donors in Bezeklik cave 20 who stand on a narrow carpet with wave patterns (fig.1.9). While ampler, and with the addition of wide lapels, this robe features decorative bands on arms, wrists, and hem. The sleeves cover the hands of the women, as was the case with the male donors in cave 20, and, like the men, they carry flowers. Although the robes appear to be made of a monochrome tan material, the lapels are embellished with scrolling patterns in gold and red, possibly representing embroidery. These accent the elaborate earrings and golden headdresses and hairpins worn by both women. Their hair is done in what von Gabain calls the “winged hairstyle” (Flügelfrisur), being fashioned into two “wings” on both the right and left of the head, and a fifth “wing” in the back. This was topped by a bejeweled headdress and hairpins, to which a red sash was attached.

---

50 Sören Stark, “Some Remarks on the Headgear of the Royal Türks,” *Journal of Inner Asian Art and Archaeology* 4 (2009), 121, 124. Lilla Russell-Smith also notes while the figures wearing these types of robes and headdresses are usually identified as Uighur princes, this interpretation has been disputed by Jorinde Ebert (in an unpublished paper) who argues the tiara is indicative of military rank rather than noble status. See Russell-Smith, *Uygur patronage in Dunhuang*, 25.

51 Gabain, *Das Leben im uigurischen Königreich von Qoco*, 118.
that hung down the back, as we see in this example. According to von le Coq, the cartouche to the right of the figures reads, “[This is] a picture of her highness Princess Joy.”

Von Gabain links this round collared, front closing robe to a “Sogdian model that can ultimately be traced to Byzantium.” There are certainly similarities between this robe and Central Asian caftans, or riding costume, worn by Sogdians and Sasanians before them. However, it is much more likely that fitted coats and trousers were transmitted from Central Asia eastward to the Turfan region and westward to Byzantium, rather than originating in Byzantium and moving eastward. The relevance of Sogdian and Central Asian riding costumes to Uighur dress will be discussed in detail below.

The second type of painted Uighur dress is a robe that closes on either the left or right side, creating a V-neck closing such as is found in Bezeklik cave 41 (fig. 1.10). Male garments of this type are characterized by a shorter outer robe or jacket, the hem of which generally falls somewhere below the knee and mid-calf allowing us to see trousers and boots underneath. Female robes are ankle-length, as in category one (fig. 1.11). The over-robe or coat can be long or short sleeved, and short-sleeved examples are always paired with a long-sleeved under-robe or shirt. According to the pictorial evidence

---

52 “‘ögrünč tigin t(ä)mgrim körki’ = ‘(dies ist) das Bild Ihrer Hoheit der Fürstin Freude (Laetitia).’” Albert von le Coq, Chotscho (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer 1913), 30. See also Härtel and Yaldiz, Along the ancient silk routes, 169.
53 Gabain, Das Leben im uigurischen Königreich von Qoco, 123.
54 “It is an accepted fact, that sewn and fitted clothes were not ‘invented’ in the great riverine civilizations of Mesopotamia an Egypt or in the classical world, but instead conceived by nomadic tribes in the Asian steppe belt with its harsh climate.” Elfriede R. Knauer, “A Quest for the Origin of the Persian Riding-Coats: Sleeved Garments with Underarm Openings,” in Cäcilia Fluck and Gillian Vogelsang-Eastwood (eds.), Riding Costume in Egypt: Origin and Appearance, (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 8
available to us, the iteration of these robes worn by men appears to have been worn primarily by young men. Robes in category two appear to be more practical and much less decorative than the ankle-length front-closing robes. Perhaps they were worn in a more quotidian context.

The painted portrayals of Uighur donors differ substantially from the two excavated robes. Robes with small repeat designs, as depicted in the donor paintings, may have existed, but there is no material evidence for this. The collars on the excavated robes close to the right in a shallow V-neck, which differs from the deeper V-neck we find portrayed in the donor paintings. In addition, all of the painted robes portray side slits on the robes, while the excavated examples have slits in the back. The contrast between the donor portraits with the excavated robes illustrates the potential variety of dress worn during the Uighur period, and the difficulty of categorizing and defining dress, especially when basing clothing types on pictorial examples.

**Connections with Central Asian Robes**

The two excavated robes from Alar use motifs derived from the tradition of Central Asian textile patterns and weaves, which is unsurprising since the Tarim Basin Uighurs certainly incorporated Central Asian clothing styles into their dress. These were transmitted by the Sogdians, and by traditions apparently already present in the Tarim Basin prior to their arrival in the mid-ninth century, such as Tocharian dress illustrated in the Kizil Buddhist caves. It is therefore illuminating to compare aspects of Uighur clothing with those of the Sogdians and Tocharians. The Sogdians were a Middle Iranian
group whose cultural center was situated at Samarkand, in present-day Uzbekistan, but who also lived in pockets all over the Tarim Basin into China from about the sixth century BCE until the Arab conquests of Central Asia in the eighth century CE. Sogdians were involved in international trade between China, the Tarim Basin, and Central Asia, and therefore maintained regular contact with both the Tang dynasty and the Uighurs. Some of the best-preserved representations of Sogdians are found near Samarkand, at Afrasiab and Panjikent. The Tocharians were an Indo-European reading and writing people of debated origin who inhabited the Tarim Basin in the first millennium CE. They are thought to have been depicted in donor portrayals in the Kizil caves (form the 4th-7th centuries CE) situated north of the Taklamakan desert in the Tarim Basin. Much more is known about the Sogdians, but the Tocharians provide a good secondary example of a people portrayed wearing Central Asian style dress inhabiting the Tarim Basin prior to the arrival of the Uighurs.

One of the best-known depictions allegedly portraying Tocharians is a mural with four male figures (“Tocharian knights”) from the Cave of the Sixteen Sword Bearers.

---


57 See Härtel and Yaldiz, *Along the ancient silk routes*, 168 for attributing a Tocharian identity to certain figures in the Kizil caves and Angela Howard, “In Support of a New Chronology for the Kizil Mural Paintings,” *Archives of Asian Art*, vol. 44 (1991), 70 for dating of Kizil cave temples.

58 These four figures are identified as “Tocharian knights” in many sources including Härtel and Yaldiz, *Along the ancient silk routes*, 168.
(cave 8, or Höhle der Sechzehn Schwertträger) now in the Museum für Indische Kunst in Berlin (fig.1.12). The four figures stand frontally oriented, with heads turned to the lower left. Each wears a front closing coat with V-neck opening and a belted waist. The coat falls below the knee, and below it we see trousers tucked into boots. As in Uighur examples, the coats have decorative bands at the wrists, down the front closing, and the hem. The four figures strike identical poses, with the left hand holding the hilt of a dagger tucked into the belt, and right hand raised. A long sword hangs on the left. Their hair appears reddish and is cropped into a page-boy style cut that falls below their ears. The portrayals of their dress have a clear connection to painted depictions of Sogdian merchant wear, as we find in the eight-century murals from Panjikent (fig. 1.13).

In the Panjikent murals, merchants are portrayed wearing robes that fall at the mid-calf, as in both the example of Tocharians and our side-closing second type of painted Uighur dress. They are front closing, with a rounded collar and decorative bands down the closing in the front, as well as on the neck, wrists and hem, as with the central front closing robe style of painted Uighur dress. Our depicted versions of Uighur robes are decorated with repeat patterns of floral or geometric designs comparable to the Tocharian paintings, while the excavated examples have a combination of repeat patterns and large pearl roundels with zoomorphic motifs in their centers, similar to painted Sogdian robes. Yet another similarity between depicted front-closing Uighur robes and

---

60 For a discussion of the potential connections the Tocharian long sword has to European arms, i.e. the Hallstadt swords, see Ulf Jaeger, “The New-Old Mummies from Eastern Central Asia: Ancestors of the Tocharians?” *Sino-Platonic Papers* No. 84 (Oct, 1998), 3.
painted Sogdian merchant dress are the belts with various belongings represented hanging from them, including sheathed daggers and small bags.

Though these are clear similarities, there are also major differences between Uighur and Sogdian robes, specifically in the cuts of the garments. Sogdian robes have a tight upper section connected to a skirt that flares out, as represented in the Panjikent murals and confirmed by excavated examples such as those uncovered in Moskevaja Balka, in the North Caucasus (figs. 1.14, 1.15) from the eighth to tenth centuries. In this restored example in the collection of the Metropolitan Museum of Art we find a left-side closing caftan type robe that probably reached somewhere below the knee to the mid-calf, with a slit in the back, as in the excavated examples of Uighur robes. The Central Asian caftan was made of linen, with decorative bands on the hem and down the front made of weft-faced compound twill (samite) showing a repeat pattern of Sogdian-style pearl roundel motifs – the same sort of weave used on the two robes from Alar. Although the front of the robe resembles the V-neck closed robes in our category two of Uighur dress, an examination of the sides and back shows the addition of flaps to the upper part of the garment, a feature that we are not able to distinguish in Uighur donor depictions. In addition, in the Uighur paintings it is unclear in some cases if the robe is simply cinched by a belt, or in fact sewn to fit this profile. While there exist many examples of both depicted and excavated examples of Sogdian and Central Asian dress, we recall the only

---

62 Knauer describes the material and structure of the MMA caftan in “A Man’s Caftan and Leggings from the North Caucasus,” 125.
examples of Uighur dress known to us, the robes from Alar, do not correspond to the donor portraits. The result of this is that we are able to analyze the cut and fabrics of Central Asian dress in much greater detail than the painted representations of Uighurs.

In comparing Uighur dress to Central Asian examples I hope to have shown that with robing, as with other forms of artistic production, there are often somewhat ambiguous differences between the robes of different cultures, as borrowing and exchange happened over an extended period, and was not unidirectional.

II. Liao dress

The Liao dynasty, founded by the Khitan leader Abaoji in 907 CE, was the first of the three post-Tang non-Chinese dynasties to rule major parts of China. The manner in which this semi-nomadic people ruled over substantial areas in what is today north China was taken as a prototype for the later Jin and Yuan dynasties. The Liao deftly combined Tang-Song and Khitan systems of government, dress, and culture and thereby created a new style of empire in the Chinese cultural sphere, ultimately being the first non-Chinese empire to be considered an equal by a Chinese imperial court. While the Yuan dynasty was not a direct successor state to the Liao, many of the prototypes set forth by the Liao for both political and cultural regulations and institutions were adopted first by the Jin

---


and subsequently by the Yuan. Therefore, Liao textile production, court dress, and clothing regulations may shed light on those of the Yuan. In addition, there is at present more abundant visual material available for Liao dress than there is for that of the Jin. While we cannot assume that the Jin simply adopted Liao clothing and customs wholesale, the Liao material is nonetheless important in our considerations of Jin and Yuan dress.

Sources

Sources for Liao court dress are found in both visual material and textual records, including excavated textiles, tomb murals, court painting, accounts by Song envoys to the Liao court, and the Liao shi, compiled in the Yuan dynasty under the direction of the official Tuotuo (脫脱, Toqtogha, c. 1314-1356). The challenge when reading descriptions of dress in the Liao shi is understanding what exactly the court was wearing as many terms for dress and textiles are Chinese terms used in idiosyncratic ways to describe Liao clothing, or clothing names transliterated directly from Khitan language. Therefore, reading such descriptions in conjunction with the visual sources is key, even if it is not possible to determine a precise relationship between depiction and description for every item.

65 For example, David Morgan proposes that both the office of darughachi (imperial commissioner) and the yam postal relay system used under the Mongol empire were Khitan innovations. See David O. Morgan, “Who Ran the Mongol Empire?” Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, No. 1 (1982), 129.

66 Naomi Standen discusses the differing circumstances behind the seemingly coherent project of compiling the “Three Histories” (those of the Liao, Jin, and Yuan) during the late Yuan (1344-45) in Naomi Standen, “Integration and Separation: The Framing of the Liao Dynasty (907-1125) in Chinese Sources,” Asia Major, 24 (2011), 147-198.
Examples of Liao dress have been excavated from the Princess of Chen tomb (1018 CE) in Inner Mongolia, and a Liao tomb on Tuerji Hill in Inner Mongolia, among other locations. Some textiles are also preserved in the Abegg-Stiftung in Riggisberg, the Musée Guimet in Paris, the China National Silk Museum in Hangzhou, the Chris Hall Collection in Hong Kong, the Cleveland Museum of Art, and the Metropolitan Museum of Art. The National Palace Museum in Taipei has several court paintings featuring Liao dress, and other pictorial depictions are found in a number of tombs in North China.

The form and function of Khitan court dress is more easily understood within the context of both textile production within the Liao State and the textile trade with Song China. Many of the techniques and patterns popular with Liao nobility were transmitted to the Jin and Yuan. Therefore, we will first look at the textiles themselves before turning to the types of clothing worn by the court.

---


Textile Production and Consumption

The Liao used both domestically produced textiles as well as those imported from China. According to the *Liao shi*, captured Han weavers worked alongside Khitan artisans within Liao territory.\(^{71}\) Han subjects came into Liao territory in three principle periods: (1) during the first years of the dynasty as a result of Abaoji’s raids; (2) as refugees from the chaos surrounding the fall of the Tang dynasty; (3) or during the reign of the second Liao emperor, Deguang (德光) (Liao Taizong 遼太宗, r. 927-947). During Deguang’s reign the Sixteen Prefectures, an area of Northern China, was given to the Liao as a reward for supporting the short-lived Later Jin (後晉) dynasty (c. 936-946).\(^{72}\) Trade with Song China existed from the establishment of the Liao and the passage of textiles from Song to Liao territory only increased after the Treaty of Shanyuan or Tanyuan in 1005, which, among other concessions, guaranteed that the Song send the Liao two hundred thousand bolts of silk every year.\(^{73}\)

Although first introduced in the Tang dynasty, one of the most prominent weaves produced in Liao territory was the so-called “Liao samite,” a compound twill with weft-facing on both sides woven right-side facing down and requiring a pattern loom equipped with both lifting and lowering shafts.\(^{74}\) Several of the Liao textiles in the Abegg-Stiftung

---

\(^{71}\) Both Han and Khitan weavers worked in the *Ling jin yuan* (綾錦院) in Zuzhou (祖州). See *LS juan* 37, (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1974), 441-442.


\(^{74}\) Zhao Feng, *Treasures in Silk: An Illustrated History of Chinese Textiles* (Hong Kong: ISAT/Costume Squad Ltd, 1999), 155.
collection, including a yellow coverlet with floral designs in roundels (fig. 1.16), were made using this technique. The same type of loom also produced a related weave known as satin samite, a compound satin weave that was weft-faced on both sides, of which I am not aware of extant examples.\(^{75}\)

In addition to these double weft-faced patterned weaves, the use of a supplementary weft to add a decorative motif was a technique that continued into the Jin and Yuan dynasties. Textiles including patterns formed by a supplementary weft, often using metallic threads, are found on gauzes, tabbies, and twills during this period. Gilded and silvered threads, usually made in Liao, Jin, and Yuan dynasty workshops of animal substrate cut into thin strips with metallic foil applied to one side, were often woven as a supplementary weft into tabby or twill-weave silks. In both Liao and Jin examples, patterns include evenly spaced round, teardrop, or palmette patterns featuring asymmetrical animal and floral motifs woven with a supplementary weft using gilded threads, a type that continued to be produced in the Jin and the Yuan.

An example of this is AEDTA no. 3270 in the Musée Guimet which shows a pattern in gold thread of coiled dragons on a red background and was radiocarbon dated to 720–1010 CE and argued to be typical of the Liao period based on both stylistic and technical grounds (fig. 1.17).\(^{76}\) This textile is very similar to a piece dated to the Jin dynasty, also on stylistic and technical grounds, in the collection of the Metropolitan

---

\(^{75}\) Zhao Feng, *Treasures in Silk*, 155.

Museum of Art (fig. 1.18), and illustrates the difficulty of differentiating some Liao and Jin textiles, especially when provenance is lacking. Indeed, in his Illustrated History of Chinese Textiles, Zhao Feng groups Liao and Jin textiles together due to their similarity of design. Based on the number of surviving examples, textiles with a supplementary weft made of gilded threads appear to have been popular among the Liao elite, although the general consensus among textile specialists is that this technique was more representative of Jin and Yuan textiles. Textiles of this kind often fall into the rubric of “brocade” or “brocaded” (Chinese: jin 锦) textiles in both Chinese and English publications. This appellation, which as noted above, many textile historians view as problematic, is used to describe textiles woven with a brocading weft, which often uses metallic threads.

Textiles were patterned using embroidery, printing, painting, and dyeing during the Liao dynasty. The surviving material features a quantity of embroidery. First

---

77 WSWG, 116.
78 Textiles purchased on the art market often lack provenance as they were likely loot from tombs in China. The only way to date them, other than by technical and stylistic analysis, is through radiocarbon dating. This costly process has been undertaken by the Abegg-Stiftung on their Liao textile collection. Krishna Riboud, whose collection is now in the Musée Guimet, also had a few of her textiles radiocarbon dated, as has Chris Hall, whose collection is in Hong Kong and Singapore. As of a visit to the Guimet in May, 2014, it appeared to me that there may be some Jin or even Yuan pieces categorized as Liao pieces in the collection located in Guimet storage – my impression was based on known similar textiles that have been dated to the Jin or Yuan dynasties. The curator agreed that there needed to be some reevaluation of the dates of the collection as a whole.
79 Zhao Feng, Treasures in Silk, 152-157.
80 Regina Krahl, James Watt, and Anne Wardwell believe that textiles woven with a supplementary weft in gold thread, or gold brocaded textiles, are more representative of the Jin and Yuan dynasty than the Liao dynasty. See Regina Krahl, “Medieval Silks Woven in Gold: Khitan, Jurchen, Tangut, Chinese or Mongol?” Orientations 28.4 (April 1997), 51 and WSWG, 108. However, in addition to mentions of gold textiles in the LS, we have evidence of Liao-era textiles woven with gold from the tomb of the Princess of Chen, as well as radiocarbon dated examples from the AEDTA (Musée Guimet) and Abegg-Stiftung collections.
produced in the Tang (fig. 1.19), satin stitch embroidery flourished in the Liao, and was often used in conjunction with the technique of couching to add gilded threads to the textile surface.\(^{81}\) This combination can be seen on several pieces in the Abegg-Stiftung collection, and is used to particularly dazzling effect in a fragment with phoenixes preserved in the Cleveland Museum of Art (fig. 1.20) and a fragment with dragons in the AEDTA collection at the Musée Guimet (fig. 1.21). Both fragments were likely meant to be the center design on the front and back of robes. It is likely that such robes with a central animal motif indicated rank and were the model on which robes with a central badge (referred to as *xiongbei* 胸背) in the Yuan dynasty were based. In the CMA fragment, confronted phoenixes form a symmetrical pattern, while the AEDTA piece features two dragons circling a flaming pearl and is not quite symmetrical. The phoenixes are formed with satin stitch, with remnants of couching visible outlining the birds.\(^{82}\) The dragons on the other hand seem to be mostly formed with gold and silver couching; each scale is carefully delineated which gives a three-dimensional effect. As with the textiles patterned with a gilded supplementary weft, based on the surviving corpus, couching and satin stitch embroidery seem to have been frequently used to decorate elite dress.

*Kesi* was another textile produced in Liao workshops and documented as a material used for imperial dress in the *Liao shi*.\(^{83}\) Liao *kesi* used both silk and gold threads, and is characterized by a regular weave with fine threads used in the weft, which creates a smoother overall surface and a finer design than is seen in contemporary

---

\(^{81}\) Zhao Feng, *Treasures in Silk*, 155.
\(^{82}\) For a full analysis of the CMA piece see *WSWG*, 178.
\(^{83}\) For example, a description of the emperor’s robe in *LS juan* 56, 906.
Northern Song or Central Asian *kesi*.\textsuperscript{84} Some of the best-preserved examples of Liao *kesi* are found forming the material of boots uncovered in Liao burials. A well-preserved pair in the collection of the Cleveland Museum of Art have a design of confronted phoenixes and cloud-like scrolls (fig. 1.22). On them, we see remnants of gold thread used in the weft, and the slits between each color of the pattern are barely noticeable.

**Descriptions of Dress**

In the *Liao shi*, court dress is divided into two major categories, “Khitan state” dress (guofu 國服) and “Han” dress (漢服 hanfu). Both styles of dress were worn at court, subject to restrictions based on the rank of various officials and the geographical location of officials. The most specific descriptions of clothing are reserved for that of the emperor and empress, while dress of officials is designated in more generalized terms.\textsuperscript{85} The *Liao shi* identifies six basic types of “Khitan state” dress: (1) ceremonial dress (*jifu* 祭服), (2) court dress (*chaofu* 朝服), (3) official dress (*gongfu* 公服), (4) ordinary dress (*changfu* 常服), (5) hunting dress (*tianliefu* 田獵服), and (6) mourning clothing (*diaofu* 弔服).\textsuperscript{87} Han dress on the other hand has four categories: (1) ceremonial dress (*jifu* 祭服),

\textsuperscript{84} WSWG, 60.
\textsuperscript{85} The following information about clothing is based on *LS* juan 56, 905-911.
\textsuperscript{86} John Vollmer refers to this as “semiformal dress” in the Ming context (see *Silks for Thrones and Altars*, 56). However, since this dress seems to have been worn for various rites and rituals primarily, I have chosen the term “ceremonial dress”
\textsuperscript{87} *LS*, juan 56, 905-907.
(2) court dress \textit{(chaofu 朝服)}, (3) official dress \textit{(gongfu 公服)}, and (4) ordinary dress \textit{(changfu 常服)}.\textsuperscript{88}

The appellation “Han” in the Liao period generally referred to the Northern Song, though looking at what this actually meant when applied to Liao court dress shows that “Han” clothing was likely based on Tang court styles, perhaps with later additions inspired by interactions with the Northern Song court. The six types of Khitan state dress and the four types of Han dress provides a starting point for a typology of Liao court dress and can be useful to help identify types of dress found and depicted in tombs. The appropriation of Han court dress and the codification of “state” style court dress are both indicative of a desire to show political legitimacy regarding the Chinese courts to the south (first those of the Five Dynasties, then of the Northern Song) as well as create an equivalent courtly aesthetic. Translations of \textit{juan} 56 of the \textit{Liao shi}, are supplemented where noted by entries in the \textit{Qidan Guozhi} (契丹國志), a text which seems to have been the basis of much of the court dress section of the \textit{Liao shi}.\textsuperscript{89} Many of the descriptions of dress from the \textit{Liao shi} are almost identical to corresponding sections from the \textit{Song shi}.

\textsuperscript{88} \textit{LS, juan} 56, 907-911.

\textsuperscript{89} A comparison of the clothing section in \textit{Qidan Guozhi juan} 23, to the description of court dress in the \textit{Guofu} section of \textit{Liao shi juan} 56 shows that entire phrases and descriptions were lifted from the \textit{Qidan Guozhi} by the compilers of the \textit{Liao shi}. The \textit{Qidan Guozhi}, written sometime between 1241-1252 during the Southern Song dynasty by Ye Longli (葉隆禮) (?-after 1267) is a biographical history of the Khitan and the Liao dynasty. See Louis Hambis, “A propos du K’i-tan Kouo Tche,” \textit{Silver Jubilee Volume of the Zinbun Kagaku Kenkyusyo}, Kyoto University (1954), 175-176; Wakamatsu Hiroshi in Etienne Balazs and Yves Hervourt (ed.), \textit{A Sung Bibliography} (Bibliographie des Sung) (Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 1978), 90. In addition, the sections on Han dress are very similar to prior Chinese historical descriptions of court dress, and while probably somewhat accurate, rely on heavily conventionalized descriptions. However, these descriptions are the most complete textual evidence we have for Liao court dress and are useful when taken in conjunction with the material record.
and the Jin shi. Here, we will look at selected extracts of Liao shi juan 56 that can be tied to pictorial material or otherwise give specific insights into Liao court dress.

**Khitan State Style Dress (Guofu)**

**Khitan State Official Dress**

According to the Liao shi, Khitan “official dress” (gongfu 公服) was called something like zhanguo (展裹) in the Khitan language, and was purple (zi 紫). The emperor’s official dress consisted of a purple-black turban and a narrow purple robe, a jade belt, and sometimes a red overcoat. Purple robes were apparently standard attire for both Liao officials and the emperor; this tradition continued into the Jin dynasty. However, I am not aware of any depictions or excavated evidence showing fully purple robes. Rather, we often find officials wearing red-colored robes, for example in all of the Xuanhua tombs, and in the portraits of emperors. There are many words in Chinese used to designate red in the dynastic histories (including hong 紅, fei 緋, chi 赤), so it seems unlikely that robes described as “purple” or “violet” (zi 紫) in the dynastic history were actually red. However, historic understandings of what constituted “purple” are much less clear-cut than modern understanding of what range of shades can be considered purple.\(^{91}\)

---

\(^{90}\) *LS, juan 56, 906.*

\(^{91}\) Regarding early (pre-Tang) dyes, Zhao Feng and Xu Zheng focus on plant-based blues, reds, yellows, and whites. Blues dyes were made using indigo and woad, among other plants. Reds dyes were extracted from safflower (the red had to be separated from the yellow dye in the plant) or madder. In their account, they also mention the origins of safflower, which was said to come from Central Asia and was brought to the Western Han dynasty by Zhang Qian (d. c. 114 BCE). It was not until the Tang dynasty that the yellow and red pigments of safflower were properly extracted, which explains the often orangey hue of earlier textiles. Zhao Feng and Xu Zheng, *The Ancient Art of Silk Weaving and Dyeing* (Beijing: Cultural Relics Press, 2008), 73.
Evidence for purple dyes exists from the pre-Liao/Song period, but these are generally found on small pieces, not on entire robes. It seems that the textual evidence and visual evidence indicates that such robes were, if anything, a shade of what we would now call red or red-brown. The Liao shi (and Jin shi) frequently mention purple robes, and there is an abundance of evidence for monochrome red robes or varying shades.

**Khitan State Ordinary Dress**

We read that “ordinary dress” (changfu 常服), transliterated from the Khitan as panguo （盤裹）was used in diplomatic ceremonies.92 Ordinary dress consists of green floral motifs on a narrow robe, and the under robe (zhongdan 中單) was often red or green. Nobles wore sable coats, with the purple and black ones considered most valuable, the green ones less valuable. The most valued kind of fur was ermine, especially those with pure white fur.93 The cheaper varieties of furs worn include those made of weasel, sheep, rodents, and corsac fox. Fur and pelts were prestige materials for steppe groups; in pictorial representations we frequently find tiger skins as saddle cloths as well as fur-

---

Elena Phipps discusses the use of purple dyes in Elena Phipps, “Cochineal Red: The Art History of a Color,” *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin*, New Series, vol. 67, no. 3 (Winter, 2010), 4-48. Phipps points out that the only truly bright red/purple colors that were used in Chinese textiles were imported from India and South East Asia, made from lac (*Kerria lacca*) (9). However, it does not appear that this was used as a dye for entire robes. Cochineal dyes were imported from America to China during the Qing dynasty (40). However, the period that we are considering here is not addressed. Nonetheless, evidence is lacking for truly “purple” colors being produced as overall dyes for textiles during this time.

92 Description of Khitan State Ordinary Dress from *LS*, *juan* 56, 907.

93 Ermine, that is what stoats (*Mustela ermine*) are called when their coat turns white during the winter, and sable (*Martes zibellina*), a type of marten, are indigenous to Mongolia and the steppe region and are the type of animals used in the finest fur coats described in the *Liao shi*. For historical context of ermine coats in the Liao period see Roslyn Lee Hammers, “Khubilai Khan Hunting: Tribute to the Great Khan,” *Artibus Asiae*, vol. 75.1 (2015), 38.
trimmed hats, as in the painting *Going out for the Hunt* and its corresponding album leaf, *Returning from the Hunt*, both attributed to Hu Gui (dated to after 937) in the National Palace Museum, Taipei (figs. 1.23, 1.24). Full fur coats are more rarely depicted, and would have been reserved for the highest members of the ruling class. An antecedent for such coats is found represented in the tomb of Xu Xianxiu (c. 571 CE) from the Xianbei-established Northern Qi dynasty (fig. 1.25).

**Khitan State Hunting Dress**

The *Liao shi* describes the emperor’s hunting dress (tianliefu 田獵服) as consisting of a turban, armor, and a marten, goose neck or duck head around the waist. The *Liao shi* also informs us that when the upper level officials, both Khitan and Han, dressed for the hunt all their clothing closed on the left and was black-green.\(^{94}\) In contemporary depictions of hunting scenes, however, the color of the robe appears to range from light blue to grey or beige. In Hu Gui’s album leaves *Going out for the Hunt* and *Returning from the Hunt*, the figures, mounted on horseback, wear long over-robes in light blue, grey, and beige, and under-robes in red can be seen at the collar and the hem. The hunters in these paintings wear their hair in the distinctive kunfa (髡髪) tonsured hairstyle characteristic of the Khitan.\(^{95}\) As with the Uighur donor portraits, we cannot take pictorial representations for the genuine article, although these paintings do reveal

\(^{94}\) *LS, juan* 56, 907.

something about how a court artist felt that Khitan hunters should be depicted. A close examination of these paintings reveals a gold border design at the collar, cuffs, hem, and left-side closing of the robe, reminiscent of the placement of border decoration on front closing robes depicted on the Uighur donors in Bezeklik cave 16 (fig. 1.26). Difficult to see, even with the aid of a magnifying glass, they appear to be either a geometric design or a decorative script. If this indeed does represent a script pattern this may be evidence for a prototype of a design that became widespread during the Mongol period when decorative script along the borders of silk textiles produced in Mongol territories across Asia, and even represented in contemporary Italian paintings and preserved in church treasuries.\(^{96}\) In addition, the fine quality of the robes confirms that at least in idealized representation, luxurious rather than practical materials may have been used for hunting robes at least in ceremonial contexts, something we should keep in mind when we approach Jin dynasty hunting robes.

Another example of a painted hunting party, in a mural from the Lamagou tomb located in Aohan Qi, Kelidai County, Inner Mongolia (fig. 1.27), the members of the hunting party are dressed in long over-robes with round collars; their under-robe has a higher collar that just shows over the top of the round collar of the over-robe, and they are equipped with belts with various useful objects hanging from the waist. This depiction is certainly not of the same quality as Hu Gui’s album leaves, but

\(^{96}\) Such inscribed textiles are discussed in the Jin dress section of this chapter, in Chapter 2, and in the Conclusion.
characteristics present in the clothing of figures in both paintings give us confirmation of certain details likely considered essential to the portrayal of Liao-era hunting scenes.

The description and portrayal of hunting robes closing on the left conforms to the long tradition in China of identifying so-called “barbarians” by how they fastened their robes\(^\text{97}\). The custom of fastening the robe on the left, in contrast to the “correct” Chinese style of fastening on the right, is attributed to an assortment of non-Chinese groups, including the Xiongnu in the *Hanshu*\(^\text{98}\) and unidentified earlier “barbarians” in the *Analects*.\(^\text{99}\) However, we know from both the pictorial and archaeological record that Liao (as well as Jin and Yuan) robes could close on either the right or the left side. The Liao wore multiple layers of clothing, probably to maximize warmth, as we see in the hunting paintings. For example, in most depictions of Khitan attendants found in tombs,

\(^{97}\) This continues today, see for example the English abstract of Zhao Feng, Wang Le, and Wang Mingfang’s article on the Uighur robes from Alar which refers to the “crossed collar and the right lapel of minorities.” Zhao Feng, Wang Le, and Wang Mingfang, “Study on Two Brocade Robes,” 73.


“Thus, according to the [Chun qiu] classic, inside was the Chinese empire and outside were the barbarous nations. The barbarians are covetous and greedy of gain; their hair hangs down over their bodies, and their coats are buttoned on the left side [i.e., as opposed to the Chinese coats, buttoned on the right side]. They have human faces, but the hearts of beasts; they are distinguished from the natives of the empire both by their manners and their dress; they differ both in their customs and their food, and in language they are mutually unintelligible. They live retired among the northern hills and the secluded deserts, leading their flocks wherever pasture is to be found; hunting is the business of their life. Divided from each other by the hills and valleys, and isolated by the sandy desert, nature has placed a geographical separation between the inner and outer nations.” Alexander Wylie, trans., “History of the Heung-No in Their Relations with China. (Translated from the Tseen-Han-Shoo.” *Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*, vol. V (1876), 79-80.

male figures wear a long-sleeved, calf-length outer robe with a round collar which closes in the front or to the side, as in the robes depicted in Hu Gui’s album leaves.

**Han Dress (Hanfu)**

According to the *Liao shi*, Tang-style court dress was adopted by the Liao from the very beginning of Emperor Shizong’s reign (947-951), when on the first day of the first month of the first year of Datong (947), Emperor Shizong entered into Jin (晉) territory, receiving the congratulations of the civil and military officials at the Chongyuan hall in what would become the Northern Song capital of Kaifeng (formerly known as Bianjing 汴京). The *Liao shi* goes on to explain that when the Liao returned to the north, they took with them various Tang and Jin objects, which were categorized and preserved in a written record. According to François Louis, these objects were “Later Jin regalia” symbolizing the “ultimate transfer of the political mandate and Liao’s unchallenged power.” Thus we understand the importance of appropriating Chinese court ritual and dress to establish the political power of the Liao dynasty.

To help us understand the Han style dress described in this section a comparison with Tang and Northern Song imperial portraits will be useful. The descriptions of dress in this section range in detail and specificity, and consulting imperial portraiture is helpful when attempting determine specific clothing that Liao emperor was wearing as “Han” dress.

---

100 *LS, juan 56*, 907.
Han Ceremonial Dress

The imperial headdress was bedecked with “gold decorative ornaments and twelve hanging white pearl pendants,” while silk ribbons were grouped together to form the chin strap and the color of the chin strap, corresponded to that of the Emperor’s shou (綬) sash. The ceremonial robe was black and red, the skirt light crimson with twelve motifs. The eight motifs on the robe were: the sun, moon, stars, dragons, pheasants, fire, mountains, and zongyi patterns. The four motifs on the skirt were aquatic plants, powdered rice, and black and white (fu 靈) and black and blue (fu 鬲) embroidered patterns. On the collar and cuffs of the robe there were designs of ascending dragons, and six registers of designs. The under-robe (zhongdan 中單) was made of white gauze, a black and white embroidered (fu 靈) collar, and the front and back decorated with a border pattern of blue. The emperor also wore a leather belt with an embroidered pattern of black and blue (fu 鬲), as well as a larger girdle, a colored shou sash, and his shoes are decorated with gold ornaments. The twelve patterns described on the emperor’s robe above were a rendition of the so-called “Twelve Imperial Symbols” depicted on imperial dress from as early as the Northern Wei dynasty.

102 Zhao Feng defines the shou as “a decorative piece hung from the waist on the back, to dedicate the position of the person in a formal ceremony.” Zhao Feng and Jin Lin (eds.), Gold/Silk/Blue and White Porcelain: Fascinating Art of Marco Polo Era (Hong Kong: Costume Squad, 2005), 89.
103 Zongyi (宗彝) was a pattern particular to imperial clothing, though it is unclear what this actually looked like.
104 All of the above from LS, juan 56, 908.
105 Zhao Feng designates the earliest known example of the Twelve Imperial Symbols as a “portrait of the King of Chu, on a lacquer painted screen uncovered from the tomb of Sima Jinlong.” See Zhao Feng,
To my knowledge there are no extant depictions of Liao emperors in “Han” style imperial dress, nor are the extant official portraits of Song emperors entirely satisfactory in terms of showing how elaborate imperial dress could be. Rather, in most of the extant official portraits of Song emperors, the emperor is seated wearing either a monochrome white or red robe, such as in the portraits in the National Palace Museum (Taipei) of Song Taizu (927-976) (fig. 1.28) and Song Huizong (r. 1100-1126) (fig. 1.29). Such monochrome robes probably approximate “ordinary” or “court dress” more closely than they do ceremonial dress.

The pictorial depiction best approximating the above-described imperial ceremonial dress is found in the Thirteen Emperors scroll attributed to Yan Liben (c. 600-673), but probably dating to the 11th century (fig. 1.30). Ning Qiang argues that the dress worn by these seven emperors was based on Tang imperial dress regulations, which, if the lineage given at the beginning of the Han fu section of Liao shi 56 is to be believed, was the precedent upon which this type of Liao imperial dress was based.106 The robes of most of the emperors are black and red. The headdress known as mian worn by seven of the emperors has twelve hanging pendants in the front and the back. The imposing figure of Emperor Wu of Jin wears a leather belt, and his robe includes depictions of at least some of the patterns listed above; we can make out a sun, moon,
stars and a mountain (fig. 1.31). Emperor Wu of the Northern Zhou clearly wears a leather belt on top of a girdle; his sash (shou), complete with a dragon, parallels the sword sheath that hangs from the other side of his belt (fig. 1.32). The seven emperors dressed in similar robes and mian have scrolling vegetal patterns recalling lingzhi fungus on the sleeve borders that match the borders of the collars of their outer robes. This, or some variation of this pattern, may correspond to the one of the patterns (such as the fu or the fu) that are not specifically described but were reserved for imperial use.

**Han Court Dress**

Who was allowed to wear Han dress, and for what occasions, was clearly regulated. Beginning in the fifth year of Chongxi (1036 CE), the Emperor wore a Han-style imperial dragon robe and the officials from both the north and south wore Han style court dress. From the middle of the Huitong period (938-947 CE) the Empress and Northern officials wore Khitan state style dress while the emperor and southern officials wore Han style dress. For the great ritual, initially the Northern officials of third rank or higher wore Han dress, though after Chongxi (1036 CE) everyone in the great ritual

---

107 Zhao Feng points out that “The actual motifs of the sun, moon, dragon and phoenix [on clothing] only appeared during the Yuan dynasty,” by which I assume he means we only have evidence for these patterns on robes existing from the Yuan dynasty. Zhao identifies a Yuan robe from the Arthur Leeper collection in the United States as the earliest example of this type of robe. See Zhao Feng, *Power Dressing*, 42-43.

108 Charles Hucker explains the official rank system as follows [I have changed the transcribed Chinese words from Wade-Giles to pinyin]: “The Nine Ranks system originated at the very end of Han, in A.D. 220. At first, ranks were specified in the following scheme: 1. upper-upper (shang-shang); 2. upper-middle (shang-zhong); 3. upper-lower (shang-xia); 4. middle-upper (zhong-shang); 5. middle-middle (zhong-zhong); 6. middle-lower (zhong-xia); 7. lower-upper (xia-shang); 8. lower-middle (xia-zhong); 9. lower-lower (xia-xia). Later there were subgradations of various sorts, with as many as 36 categories. But the standard enduring pattern that soon evolved provided for nine numbered ranks (pin) from 1 down to 9,
wore Han dress. The same dress as was used during the Huitong period was still used for daily ceremonies.\(^{109}\)

The emperor wore the “accessing heaven” (\textit{tongtian 通天}) crown during all the important rituals. His hat was adorned with a magic mountain (\textit{boshan 博山}) ornament made of gold, twelve cicadas, and jade and pearls.\(^{110}\) His robe was made of deep red gauze, with a white gauze under-robe, a white short jacket and skirt, and a deep red apron-skirt (\textit{bixi}).\(^{111}\) He wore a round and white faux collar. From his leather belt hung his sword and his \textit{shou} (sash).\(^{112}\) Something approximating this style of court dress is illustrated in the portrait of Zhao Hongyin (d. 952), father of Song Taizu (fig. 1.33). Here, Zhao Hongyin wears the \textit{tongtian} crown, although this one is adorned with a bat rather than a cicada (such as on the \textit{mian} of some of the emperors in the \textit{Thirteen Emperors} scroll). The round white faux-collar, the deep red robe, the white under robe peaking out at the collar and wrists, and a \textit{bixi} apron are all depicted. Zhao Hongyin’s robe and \textit{bixi}, are, in addition to being red, heavily patterned.

\begin{quote}
\footnotesize
\textit{LS, juan} 56, 908.
\end{quote}

---

\(^{109}\) In accordance with the preceding section, I take this to mean that the Empress and Northern officials wore Khitan state style court dress while the emperor and southern officials wore Han style court dress on these occasions. \textit{LS, juan} 56, 908.

\(^{110}\) This description is identical to the \textit{tongtian} crown described in \textit{SS, juan} 151, 3530.

\(^{111}\) Zhao Feng defines the \textit{bixi} as a part of high-ranking female dress. However, in the Song, Liao, and Jin dynastic histories it clearly forms a part of male imperial dress as well. Zhao Feng translates it as a “knee cover” and cites an example of an excavated \textit{bixi} from Cao’s tomb, Yuan Suzhou. See Zhao Feng, \textit{Gold, Silk, Blue and White}, 88.

\(^{112}\) \textit{LS, juan} 56, 908.
Han Official Dress

The description of “Han style” official dress (gongfu 公服), is remarkably similar to the description of court dress. I believe that while it was customary following Chinese tradition to subdivide dress into these specific categories, perhaps in the Liao court these clothing types were not sharply distinguished.

Han Ordinary Dress

We find much descriptive repetition in the section on “ordinary dress,” as well. The Liao called ordinary dress chuanzhi (穿執); and it was worn for everyday activities. The emperor wore a yellow robe, a cloth twisted around his head, a nine-hoop belt, and six-closure boots. The Liao shi informs us that this style originated from the Yiwen clan (the Xianbei royal family).113 After the Zhenguan era of Tang Taizong’s reign, on days that were not the new year, the winter solstice, or for the great sacrificial rituals, all emperors wore this.114

Both the civil officials and military officials of rank five and above wore specific items hanging from their belts. The civil officials wore a handkerchief (shoujing 手巾), a brush bag (suandai 算袋), a knife, a whetstone, and a gold fish pouch.115 The military

---

113 The Xianbei were a semi-nomadic people who controlled parts of northern China during the 3rd-6th centuries. See Wen Tao, Xianbei di guo (Beijing: Jiuzhou chuban she, 2007), 3. Wittfogel and Fêng point out that early Chinese sources describe the Khitan as descendants of a branch of the Xianbei (鮮卑). See Wittfogel and Fêng, 22.
114 Information about ordinary dress from LS, juan 56, 910.
115 The fish pouch, along with the “seven articles” that hung from the belt were introduced in the Tang dynasty: “The fish pouch was an innovation of 651. Made of silver or gold, it was attached to the belt to hold the fish-shaped identification credentials. The ‘seven accoutrements’ were standard issue to high-ranking Tang military officers to symbolize their prestige and authority.” Jonathan Karam Skaff, Sui-Tang
officials wore seven articles on their *diexie* (蹀躞) belts including a hanging blade, a knife, millstone, a rod case, and a bag with flint in it.\textsuperscript{116} From the Uighur section we recall items hung from the belts of donors in Bezeklik and those of Sogdian merchants in Panjikent. Belts with hanging objects from had been worn for centuries in the Central Plain, the Steppe, and Central Asia, although their popularity faded in China during the Tang dynasty.\textsuperscript{117} The *diexie* belt, which was a thin belt made of leather with short leather straps hanging from it, was a standard part of court dress in the Liao dynasty, described in the *Liao shi* as worn by court officials as part of their ceremonial dress.\textsuperscript{118} An excavated example of a *diexie* belt is found in the Liao dynasty Princess of Chen tomb, dating from 1018 (fig. 1.34). This particular example, which is embellished by eleven square gold plaques, five gold plaques in the shape of peaches, and a gold finial, in addition to silver and gold plaques attached to the hanging straps of the belt, likely is far more embellished than those worn as part of official or military dress.\textsuperscript{119} According to Zhu Qixin, the two purses that we see on this belt are decorated with patterns “similar to the *jinyu* [gold fish

\textsuperscript{116} The entire section starting from military officials until flint bag is the same as a section in the *Xintang shu, juan* 24 according to the editors of *LS, juan* 56. See 911, n. 7.


\textsuperscript{118} Zhu, “The Liao Dynasty Tomb,” 59.
pouches] worn by high officials in China during the Tang dynasty.”

This is likely the same sort of bag that is described above as part of the accouterments hanging from the belts of civil officials in ordinary dress.

Much of what we have learned about Liao dress applies to Jin dress as well. In the following section we will attempt to distinguish specifically Jin elements that characterized their dress, although according to the Jin shi there was a large quantity of overlap with Liao dress, especially regarding Han-style court dress.

III. Jin Dress

The Jin dynasty was founded by Wanyan Aguda (Taizu 太祖, r. 1115-1123), who had confederated a number of Jurchen tribes in what is today Jilin and Heilongjian provinces and overthrew the Liao dynasty in 1115. The Jin eventually pushed the Song out of north China, causing the Song to establish a capital in the south. This second period of Song rule, when the capital was at Lin’an (modern day Hangzhou) is known as the Southern Song (c. 1127-1279). The Jin was eventually overthrown by the Mongols in 1234, and many Jin officials served in the Mongol administration, even prior to the final 1234 victory. Therefore, the Jin dynasty, as the immediate precursor to the Yuan, is key to understanding certain policies and cultural practices in the Yuan, including court dress.

120 Zhu “The Liao Dynasty Tomb,” 59.
121 Morris Rossabi notes that there had been Jin defectors to the Mongols as early as 1211. Morris Rossabi, The Jurchens in the Yüan and Ming (Ithaca, NY: China-Japan Program, Cornell University, 1982), 1.
Despite its status as direct predecessor to the Yuan, Jin dynasty traditions and culturally distinctive features are often elided with the preceding Liao dynasty or the contemporary Song dynasty. Liao and Jin textiles are often included in the same section in books, and historians often cite “rapid sinicization” as a primary reason for discussing them together with the Song dynasty.\footnote{See for example Hok-lam Chan, \textit{Legitimation in Imperial China: Discussions under the Jurchen-Chin Dynasty (1115-1234)} (Seattle and London: University of Washington Press), 1984, x and Hoyt Cleveland Tillman and Stephen H. West (eds.), \textit{China under Jurchen Rule: Essays on Chin Intellectual and Cultural History} (Albany: State University of New York, 1995), 1.} As noted above, the concept of sinicization is inherently problematic; I hope to clarify how the Jin adopted and adapted certain aspects of Chinese art and court dress for their own purposes. However, Liao and Jin textiles are looked at together, because there truly was overlap in production techniques, favored motifs, and weave structures, although I hope to elucidate some differences between the two here. In addition, as is the case in historical records, there is a relative lack of material evidence for the Jin.\footnote{Tillman and West, \textit{China under Jurchen rule}, 2.}

Sources

Several Jin-era tombs containing textiles have been excavated, though not as many as from the Liao and Song dynasties.\footnote{Notably, the tomb of the King of the Qi State, Juyuan in Acheng (excavated in 1988), See Zhu Qixin, “Royal Costumes of the Jin Dynasty,” \textit{Orientations}, 21 (Dec., 1990), 59-64.} As with Liao textiles, Jin textiles are preserved in collections such as the AEDTA at the Musée Guimet, the Cleveland Museum of Art, the Metropolitan Museum of Art, and the China National Silk
Museum. Jin tombs with murals portraying occupant portraits and quotidian scenes also portray types of dress worn by the Jin and their servants. Distinguishing features are apparent in these tombs, such as an interest in depiction of theatrical scenes, and illustrations of Confucian stories of filial piety. By taking such funerary art into account alongside preserved textiles and dress, a small but important corpus of evidence of Jin court dress takes shape.

As is the case with Liao dress, the most complete record of Jin court dress is found in the Jin shi (History of the Jin Dynasty), compiled, like the Liao shi, under the direction of the Yuan official Tuotuo. Taking this textual evidence into consideration alongside the visual material will allow us to give something of a definition of types of court dress during the Jin.

Textile Types

As noted in the Liao dress section above, in the Illustrated History of Chinese Textiles, Zhao Feng makes little to no distinction between Liao and Jin textile production methods such as “Liao samite,” textiles decorated with the use of a supplementary weft, and textiles woven with gold. The difficulty in reaching a consensus for attributing extant textiles to either the Liao or Jin dynasty was also illustrated in the Liao dress

125 Fragments from the Cleveland Museum of Art and the Metropolitan Museum of Art have been published in WSWG. The AEDTA fragments have been analyzed by a group of textile specialists working in the 1990s. See Marie-Hélène Guéton et al, “Archives of Marie-Hélène Guéton and the AEDTA.”
127 Zhao Feng, Treasures in Silk: An Illustrated History of Chinese Textiles (Hong Kong: ISAT/Costume Squad Ltd, 1999), 155.
section by the nearly identical pieces patterned with coiled dragons, AEDTA no. 3270 (fig. 1.17) from the Musée Guimet, and 1989.205 (fig. 1.18) from the Metropolitan Museum, which are labeled Liao in one collection and Jin in the other.

In *When Silk Was Gold*, the authors argue that silk textiles woven with a supplementary weft in gold were “the most representative luxury textile of the Jin dynasty,” citing a relative lack of such textiles from the Liao and Song periods.\(^\text{128}\) While this is perhaps true, we cannot dismiss the popularity of such textiles in the Liao – we recall that carbon dated textiles in the Musée Guimet, Abegg-Stiftung, and Chris Hall Collection confirm this. A distinguishing feature of gold-woven textiles in the Jin dynasty, however, was the variety of weaving techniques employed to create both the gold threads and the textiles themselves. That is, Jin-era gold thread could be made by applying a thin gold foil layer to either a paper or animal substrate, which was then cut into strips. In *When Silk Was Gold*, the authors speculate that the gold threads on paper substrate may have been produced in southern Jin territories.\(^\text{129}\) In addition, there appears to have been a second manner of adding the supplementary weft, which caused the design to rise off the background of the textile due to “puckering at the contours.”\(^\text{130}\) This second type of technique seems less widespread than the flatter patterns dated to both the Liao and Jin dynasties. Techniques similar to those employed in the Liao dynasty for clamp-resist dying and embroidery were used in the Jin.\(^\text{131}\)

\(^{128}\) *WSWG*, 108.

\(^{129}\) *WSWG*, 108.

\(^{130}\) For a full description and illustrations see *WSWG*, 108 and cat. 32.

\(^{131}\) Zhao Feng, *Treasures in Silk*, 155.
Descriptions of Jin Court Dress

*Jin shi, juan* 43, “Imperial Equipage” is divided into three sections, with the second section (yufu zhong 輿服中) describing eight types of dress: (1) the emperor’s dress (天子袞冕 tianzi gunmian), (2) dress worn at court more generally (視朝之服 shichao zhi fu), (3) the empress’s dress (皇后冠服 huanghou guanfu), (4) the heir-apparent’s dress (皇太子冠服 huangtaizi guanfu), (5) the dress of high-ranking women (命婦服用 mingfu fuyong), (6) the dress of ministers (臣下朝服 chenxia chaofu), (7) sacrificial dress (祭服 jifu), and (8) official dress (公服 gongfu). Not all of these types of dress will be detailed here, as much of the description overlaps descriptions from the Liao section. The third section of *juan* 43 gives a description of “ordinary dress” (changfu 常服) which also will be considered here. As in the section on Liao dress, the text of the dynastic history will be approached alongside the visual material. Many of the descriptions of court dress are very similar to those in the *Liao shi* and the *Song shi*. We will first look at the descriptions of court dress from the second section of *juan* 43 concerning the ceremonial dress of the emperor, empress, heir apparent, imperial clansmen, and officials. Then we will move on to the description of “ordinary dress” in the third section. Comparing *juan* 43 of the *Jin shi* to *juan* 56 of the *Liao shi* is a useful

---

133 According to the chapter on Jin dress in *Zhongguo fushi tongshi*, edited by Chen Gaohua and Xu Jijun, “ordinary dress” was characterized by more distinctive Jin elements than the court dress described in the second section of *juan* 43. See Chen Gaohua and Xu Jijun, *Zhongguo fushi tongshi*, 374.
exercise in terms of determining what of the Liao and Song\textsuperscript{134} traditions were adopted by the Jin, and where the Jin may have departed from the courtly styles of these two dynasties.

**Dress Regulations**

Section two of “imperial equipage” begins with a brief description of how Jin court dress fits into the historical lineage of Chinese court dress more generally, as in the “Han dress” section of *Liao shi* 56. The Jin emperor is described as wearing a *tongtian* hat, crimson gauze robe, imperial robe and headdress (*gunmian* 袞冕), narrow shoes (*bixi* 偭舄).\textsuperscript{135} The ministers wore *diaochan* (貂蟬) style dress, which is what court dress was called during the Jin. Official clothing regulations in the Jin appear to date to the third Jin emperor, Emperor Xizong (r. 1135-1149, also known as Wanyan Hela 完顏合剌 or Wanyan Dan 完顏亶). Looking to his biography in the *Jin shi*, we find that in the fourth month of the second year of the Tianjuan (天眷) era (1139), “[it was decreed that] when the 100 officials went for a court audience, for the first time they wore court dress (*chaofu* 朝服),” and in the sixth month “for the first time [there was] imperial attire (*guanfu* 冠服).”\textsuperscript{136} Returning to *juan* 43, we read that during the reign of Zhangzong (章宗 r. 1189-1208) the ministers, citing the Han and Tang as precedent, changed the

\textsuperscript{134} Since the *Han fu* section of *LS juan* 56 is comparable to descriptions of Song court dress, the “Han style” dress section of *LS juan* 56 provides insight into both Khitan and Song court traditions.

\textsuperscript{135} Unless otherwise noted the descriptions of Jin dress in this chapter are based on translations from *Jin shi, juan* 43, 975-987.

\textsuperscript{136} *JS, juan* 4, *Zaozong ji*, 74.
ceremonial dress to blue and vermilion dress and abandoned the *diaochan* style in order to distinguish ceremonial dress from court dress. In official and court dress there were three colors: purple, red, and green. Some officials wore the narrow purple robe, some officials wore the all-black *zhanzao* (展皂). As mentioned in the Liao section, I am inclined to believe that “purple” (*zi* 紫) robes were a shade of red. Contemporary texts distinguish between “black-purple” and “red-purple” robes at court, although for example, the Southern Song writer Wang Yong explains that red-purple robes were more common in the earlier period but by his time (the 13th century) they were more black-purple in hue, which contrasts with the existing material.138

---

137 *JS*, juan 43, 975.

138 Regarding purple court robes in the Chinese context, the authors of *WSWG* write: “According to the Southern Song writer Wang Yong, in the beginning of purple robes could be worn only at court and were not permitted for daily wear. He adds that purple in those days referred to a red purple…while in his own time – in the late twelfth and early thirteenth century – purple refers to a black purple. And he expresses puzzlement at the fact that the northerners (the peoples in the Jin area, including the Jurchens and the Uyghurs) were wearing precisely that color forbidden in the early Song period.” *WSWG*, 82, note 1.

The original text reads: “國初仍唐舊制有宮者服皁袍。無宮者白袍。庶人布袍。而紫惟施於朝服非朝服而用紫者有禁尤嚴故太平興國七年。詔曰。中外宮並貫舉。人或於緋綠白袍者私自以紫於衣服者。禁之。止許白袍或皁袍。至端拱二年。忽詔士庶皆許服紫。所在不得禁止。而黑紫之禁則申嚴於仁宗之時。今虜中之乃是國初則申嚴之制。此所不可曉也。”

My translation: “At the beginning of the [Song] dynasty, the old regulations of the Tang were still observed and palace [officials] wore black robes. Those who were not palace [officials] wore white robes. The common people wore [plant fiber] cloth robes. Purple [robes] were only used at court, it was strictly forbidden to wear purple [robes] outside of court. An imperial decree in the seventh year of Taiping xingguo [981/2 CE during Taizong’s reign] stated “both inside and outside of the palace people wear red, green, or white robes, and have been wearing purple robes without permission. This is forbidden. Only white or black robes are permitted. Reaching the second year of Duangong (989 CE). The imperial decree was ignored and both officials and the common people were permitted to wear purple. It was not forbidden anywhere. Black-purple [robes] were strictly forbidden to be worn until the time of Renzong [r. 1022-1063 CE]. Now, the barbarians [i.e. Jin people] wear what was strictly prohibited at the beginning of the [Song] dynasty, which is very confusing.”

Wang Yong (王泳), *Songchao yanyi yi mou lu* (宋朝燕翼詒謀錄), in *Songdai biji xiaoshuo* vol. 1, (Hebei: jiaoyu chuban she, 1995) juan 1, 97.
The Emperor’s Dress

Imperial ritual dress (lifu 禮服) included a robe, skirt, fangxinqu collar (方心曲領), an under-robe, bixi apron, leather belt, large belt, jade sword, shou sash, hanging belt ornaments (pei 佩), shoes, and leggings or socks (wa 靴), just as is described in the section on Han-style ceremonial dress in the Liao shi, translated in the Liao dress section.\(^\text{139}\)

The following section describes the mian crown. In form it appears to have been close to the Liao description of the headdress of the same name. The description in the Jin shi also recalls the headdresses and attire worn by seven of the emperors in the Thirteen Emperors hand scroll attributed to Yan Liben (c. 600-673), discussed in conjunction with mian in the Liao section. The mian in the Jin shi has more decorations attributed to it than are seen on any of the headdresses illustrated in the Thirteen Emperors Scroll (fig. 1.30). In terms of hanging pendants, for example, there are only twelve on the front and back depicted in the painting instead of twenty-four noted in the Jin shi.\(^\text{140}\)

The next description in Jin shi juan 43 is of the imperial robe, which is also comparable to the Han style imperial robe from Liao shi juan 56. We read that:

The robe was made of a double layer of green silk gauze. It had five colors and paintings in gold, the front had depictions of the sun, the moon, four ascending dragons, twelve mountains, and six pairs of pheasants (huachong) and fires. Six

\(^{139}\) JS, juan 43, 976.
\(^{140}\) JS juan 43, 976.
pairs of tigers and monkeys were depicted at the top and bottom of the front of the garment. The back of the garment had depictions of four ascending dragons, twelve mountains, twelve pairs of pheasants and fires, and six pairs of tigers and monkeys. The under-robe was made of white silk gauze, with a silk gauze collar, cuffs, and border decoration. In addition, the emperor wore a skirt, a belt, cuffs, and borders and decoration, eight layers of red silk gauze, thirty-two embroidered aquatic plants, sixteen types of grains, and sixteen types of rice, thirty-two each of the and black and white (fu 鼎) and black and blue (fu 鑉) embroidered patterns. Lastly, the emperor wore the bixi apron skirt with a belt, cuffs, borders and decorations, with a double-layered red silk gauze, and two embroidered ascending dragons.\footnote{JS, juan 43, 976-977.}

As with the equivalent garments in the Liao shi, we are left wondering how the emperor was able to walk with all of these layers of clothing and hanging decorations encumbering him. The only real difference between this description and the one in Liao shi juan 56 of Han style imperial dress is that the number of various decorations have increased, as if the compilers of Jin shi wanted to distinguish Liao and Jin imperial ceremonial dress in some way and so decided to give the Jin more ornamentation. As far as I am aware there are no pictorial depictions of Jin emperors wearing the above-described attire.
The Empress’s Dress

The description of the Empress’s dress was equivalently elaborate to the Emperor’s dress, and similarly evocative of “Han” style imperial garb:

The empress wore a flower and pearl crown, a ceremonial gown, a skirt, an apron skirt, shoes, and stockings. The flower and pearl crown was covered in blue gauze (luo) with a blue silk tabby (juan) lining and gold and red gauze as a support. It was decorated with nine dragons, four phoenixes, and had twelve flower-and-pearl pendants hanging from the front and back. The pheasants were woven in blue-green gauze. The empress’ under-robe was made of plain blue-green gauze. Her skirt was made of deep green gauze and was woven with a decoration of six layers of pheasants. Her apron skirt was made of deep green gauze and had three layers of woven designs. Her shoes were also made of green-blue gauze with white twill-weave silk (ling) on the inside and had a ruyi (auspicious cloud) shaped front. Her stockings were also made of blue-green gauze on the interior and exterior.142

This description recalls the empress’s dress in the Song shi juan 151.143 Paintings of Song empresses give us a good pictorial correspondence to descriptions of the empress’s dress in the dynastic histories. There are several official portraits of imperial consorts in the National Palace Museum in Taipei, and the portraits of the consort of Emperor Renzong, Empress Cao (1016-1079), and the consort of Emperor Ningzong,

142 JS, juan 43, 978.
143 SS, juan 151, 3524-3533.
Empress Gongsheng (1162-1232) are particularly well preserved (figs. 1.35, 1.36). These two examples are interesting to consider together as they were painted more than a century apart. The similarities in the clothing worn by the empresses in each painting illustrates the adherence to a specific style of imperial depiction that corresponds to the conservative strain we witness in descriptions of imperial dress in the dynastic histories. This was what the empress was expected to wear in order to represent her status and role in the imperial hierarchy.

Each empress wears an elaborate blue-green crown festooned with pearls and other precious stones with elements projecting from the base on either side of the head. We find the colors of the robes worn by both empresses, blue with a pattern of paired birds (phoenixes, presumably) interspersed with geometric floral motifs. The borders and hems of the robes are decorated with patterns of dragons. In both cases, the seated empress wears either a skirt or an apron skirt under her robe featuring the same pattern found on the outer robe. The difference between the skirt and the apron skirt is more apparent in the portrait of Empress Congsheng; she also wears a shou sash.

**The Heir-Apparent’s Dress and the Dress of High-Ranking Women.**

The heir-apparent’s dress was not very different from that of the heir apparent in *Liao shi juan* 56:

He wore a robe known as gun, a mian, a green-blue jacket, a red skirt, a white gauze under robe, a skirt with blue-green border decorations, leather belt, apron skirt, red shoes, and white stockings. His gun was blue-green with decorations of
mountains, dragons, flowers and insects, fire, ancient wine vessels, and five types of flower patterns; on his red skirt were embroidered aquatic plants, grains, geometric patterns, and four types of flower patterns.\textsuperscript{144}

High-ranking women, the wives of imperial clansmen and relatives of the emperor’s wife and mother were allowed to use gold in their dress. The wives and mothers of officials of the fifth rank and above could wear the embroidered and tasseled \textit{xiapēi} (霞帔) cape.\textsuperscript{145}

**Ordinary Dress**

Ordinary dress is detailed in the third section of \textit{juan 43}, “Imperial Equipage” (\textit{yufu xia 輿服下}), and is the type of dress that corresponds to pictorially depicted and excavated examples of Jin dress. The best source of excavated Jin dress is from the tomb of the King of the Qi State. This was a double burial, probably of Wanyan Yan, a member of the imperial clan, and his wife.\textsuperscript{146} More than thirty textiles were excavated from this tomb and they provide us with useful comparisons when considering the form of ordinary Jin dress.

The \textit{Jin shi} tells us that ordinary dress was comprised of four essential elements: a hat made of black gauze, a so-called “flat-collared” robe, a belt, and leather boots.\textsuperscript{147} A hat that may correspond to this type was discovered in the tomb of the King of the Qi

\textsuperscript{144} \textit{JS, juan 43}, 979.
\textsuperscript{145} \textit{JS, juan 43}, 979.
\textsuperscript{146} Zhu Qixin, \textit{“Royal Costumes of the Jin Dynasty,” 59.}
\textsuperscript{147} \textit{JS, juan 43}, 984.
State (fig. 1.37). As described in the *Jin shi*, it is square shaped, although the hat in the King of the Qi State’s tomb is made from dark blue, rather than black, gauze. The *Jin shi* also notes that such hats were decorated with a band, which is the case in the excavated example, which appears to be adorned with gold decorations. The excavated hat also has jade openwork ornaments portraying a goose holding a lotus, and its top is decorated with beadwork, described in the *Jin shi* as “pearl decorations along the seams [of the hat] in the shape of a cross” in the *Jin shi*. One discrepancy, other than the color, between the textual description and the actual object, is that in the text, the hat has two projections on the sides, which we see on either side of the hat – these would have originally been filled with something like wood to help the side parts project out stiffly.

The “flat-collared” robe (盤領衣 *panling yi*), according to the *Jin shi*, was often white, with narrow sleeves and a “flat” collar, which I believe refers to a high, round-collared robe in the style of the Liao hunting robes and painted Uighur front-closing donor robes. This robe was calf-length in order to facilitate horseback riding and shooting. One source for what this may have looked like is found in the version of *Lady Wenji Returns to Han* in the Jilin Provincial Museum (fig. 1.38). The robe, boots, at least one of the hats, and the belts correspond to ordinary dress from the *Jin shi*.

According to *Jin shi*, the robes worn as ordinary dress often had ornamentation on the
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148 Zhu Qixin, “Royal Costumes of the Jin Dynasty,” 60.
149 According to Zhu Qixin, “Royal Costumes of the Jin Dynasty,” 60.
150 “循十字縫飾以珠” *JS, juan 43, 984.*
151 “頂之下際兩角各繡方羅徑二寸許” *JS, juan 43, 984.*
152 *JS, juan 43, 984.*
chest and shoulders, which is not the case for any of the robes worn by men in this painting. A “cloud shoulder” (or “cloud collar”) design adorns Wenji’s robe, a pattern that became even more popular during the Mongol period, both at the Yuan and the Ilkhanid courts.

Returning to the description of ordinary dress in the *Jin shi*, we read of two types of robes worn by the emperor’s entourage. First, the “spring water” style, often embroidered with a bird of prey hunting a goose motif and floral and plant motifs.\(^{153}\) This corresponds to a green silk textile with a “swan hunt” motif in a teardrop pattern in the collection of the Metropolitan Museum of Art (fig. 1.39). The green silk is in plain weave, with the motif of the swan pursued by a hawk formed by gilded supplementary weft threads.

A second robe, the “autumn mountains” robe was decorated with embroidered patterns of bears and deer in the forest and mountains.\(^{154}\) An extant robe with a pattern corresponding to the “autumn mountains” motif is in the Chris Hall Collection, in Hong Kong (fig. 1.40). The robe is made of dark blue silk twill with a large repeat pattern woven with a gold supplementary weft showing two deer in a forest with a stylized central cloud in the shape of a *lingzhi* fungus, and two geese flying above. The robe appears to have been made with two loom widths of the silk, with the top and skirt made of the same piece. The skirt flares out from a defined waist which would have been belted; an approximately 4-5 cm wide section remains that is visibly darker than the rest.

\(^{153}\) *JS, juan* 43, 984.
\(^{154}\) *JS, juan* 43, *yufu xia*, 984.
of the robe. The sleeves are narrow, and the collar high and round, in the same style as those depicted on Khitan hunters in *Going out for the Hunt* and *Returning from the Hunt* by Hu Gui (figs. 1.23, 1.24). Rather than a script or geometric decoration at the borders as in the Hu Gui paintings, however, a *kesi* border of ducks and aquatic plants adorns the collar, wrists, hem, and side closing of the robe. The robe closes to the right at the waist with a series of frogs.

On the shoulders, there is a symmetric design of a flaming pearl in the Buddhist style, and several centimeters closer to the shoulders are inscription bands about 15 cm in length (fig. 1.41). Although the text is largely indecipherable – probably a misunderstanding of the finials of the Arabic letters,\(^{155}\) which in this rendition have become blobs, we can make out the word “Allah,” in what appears to be imitation of *ṭirāz* textiles.\(^{156}\) Specifically, the linear quality and finials of the inscription imitate Kufic script, a favored script for *ṭirāz* bands in West Asia from the 9\(^{th}\)-13\(^{th}\) centuries. The inscribed bands, however, fall vertically from the shoulder towards the chest rather than on the sleeves as is more common with inscribed textiles from this period, as we will see in Chapter 4. Next to the text is a tiny Buddhist swastika. The flaming pearl and swastika might be interpreted as Buddhist, but taken together with the *ṭirāz*-like inscription, and the repeat pattern of deer in a forest, should be understood as an illustration of how various motifs were brought together on a single garment without necessarily retaining
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\(^{156}\) This script was identified as Arabic in consultation with Renata Holod in February, 2015, and via email correspondence with Sheila Blair and Jonathan Bloom in February, 2015.
the original significance of the symbols. That is to say, we can no more read this robe as having underlying Buddhist significance than we can as having any specific Muslim meaning. We might imagine, however, that the propitious symbolism of all of these visual signs was somehow conveyed and compounded with all being featured together: the pseudo-inscription gives greater socio-political status to the wearer while the Buddhist swastika and flaming pearl grant good luck, and the hunting scene recalls the import of the hunt to the Jurchen people.

This type of fine silk and gold textile would not be practical in the context of a hunt, however, as noted in the Liao section above, in depictions of elite hunting scenes, such as those depicted in the Hu Gui album leaves the figures wear fine textiles featuring gold elements. Perhaps these fine “hunting robes” were used in a ceremonial rather than practical context. The “swan hunt” textile fragment may have been used as a type of ceremonial hunting dress, probably by officials outside the royal family as it, and examples like it, are of a lesser quality than comparable royal examples, such as those from the tomb of the King of Qi State in Acheng. The outermost burial robe of the King of Qi State reveals a marked difference in styles of inscribed robes of this era (fig. 1.42). The robe is a dark brown tabby weave piece woven with a pseudo-inscription in a gold script that resembles a stylized version of Devanagari. The pattern is woven with gold thread in four-end weft-faced twill. The inscription is found on the shoulders.

157 Zhu Qixin, “Royal Costumes of the Jin Dynasty,” 60; Zhao Feng, Treasures in Silk, 188.
158 Thanks to Nicholas Harris, Susanne Kerekes, and Pushkar Sohoni.
159 Zhao Feng, “Silks in the Song, Liao, Western Xia, and Jin Dynasties,” in Dieter Kuhn (ed.) Chinese Silks, 283.
and hem of the robe, which corresponds more closely than the inscription on the blue “hunting robe” to the positioning of tirāz bands found on Central Asian robes.

IV. Tangut (Xixia) Dress

The Tangut, or Xixia (西夏) Empire ruled from c. 1038-1227 in the region of present day Gansu, Ningxia Autonomous Region, and Western Shaanxi (fig. 1.43). They formed the third regional power of the area in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, ruling contemporaneously to the Liao and the Northern Song during the first half of their rule, and to the Jin and Southern Song dynasties in the second half. In 1227 the Tangut Empire fell to the armies of Chinggis Khan, and their territory and people were incorporated into the rapidly expanding Mongol Empire. As a major regional power in the centuries leading up to the Mongol conquests with political and cultural ties to the other peoples under consideration in this chapter, Tangut dress should be considered as another prototype for certain Mongol traditions.

Although referred to by a wider variety of names, including Xia, Western Xia (Xixia), Mi-nang, and Dangxiang, I will follow the English convention of calling this group Tanguts, based on the Turko-Mongol pronunciation of their name. The Tanguts ruled over a multi-ethnic empire whose population included Tibetans, Khitan, Jurchen,
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Uighur, and Chinese subjects. Ruth Dunnell compares the term “Tangut” to the term “Mongol” in the post-Chinggisid period, observing that while it is difficult to determine what “Tangut” means ethnically, a majority of people living under Tangut rule identified with steppe ideology and traditions.

Of the peoples considered in this chapter, the Tanguts are perhaps the most difficult to approach. This is due to the lack of both surviving material evidence and relevant (and translated) Tangut language texts. It is only in recent years that Tangut and Chinese texts uncovered in Khara Khoto (黑水城 Heishui cheng) have been published in edited volumes in both Russian and Mandarin. Philologists and historians are particularly interested in the complex language system of the Tanguts, while the few art historical studies of Tangut culture focus on Buddhist art, as this is what has survived. Chen Gaohua and Xu Jijun’s monumental study of Chinese dress devotes a substantial section to the Tanguts, and is a useful survey of relevant sources and archaeological material. However, as is the case with their sections on Liao and Jin dress, they accept Chinese historical descriptions without question and approach the material from a Sinocentric perspective, constantly looking for “Sinicizing” aspects in Tangut dress.

Sources

Of the documents translated from Classical Chinese and Tangut by Chinese and Russian scholars, few focus on dress. Therefore, we are dependent on official Chinese sources and archaeological material to attempt to visualize and define Tangut dress. Tangut dress is referred to in the broader context of descriptions of the Tanguts in Chinese historical works such as the Tang dynasty history, the *Jiu Tang shu* (舊唐書) and the *Song shi*. As with the Chinese sources on Uighur, Liao, and Jin material, descriptions in Chinese official texts of non-“Han” dress should be read with some reserve, both because they may be generically applying a Chinese vocabulary to dress with little regard to differences between Chinese and Tangut dress, or using stereotypical language to describe non-“Han” (implicitly “barbarian”) dress. In addition to Chinese official histories, the Tangut legal code preserved in Chinese, the *Tiansheng gaijiu xinding lüling* (天盛改旧新定律令, “New revisions on the heavenly law”) is useful. Fortunately, a punctuated edition exists, edited by a trio of renowned Tangutologists, Shi Jinbo, Nie Hongyin, and Bai Bin, giving us regulations on dress and a good outline of the types of dress, materials, and colors that were variously allowed or prohibited to people of various social ranks. We will take this and the Chinese historical texts into consideration when looking at the donor portrayals that form the bulk of the extant material.

---


Most of what survives of Tangut art is religious, and generally Buddhist, in nature. As with the Uighurs, we can learn something about elite and imperial dress by looking at the donors in these devotional works. The majority of the paintings come from a Russian excavation of the abandoned city of Khara Khoto in 1907-1909 led by Pyotr Kuzmich Kozlov, and are preserved in the State Hermitage Museum in St. Petersburg. A 1914 mission by Aurel Stein also yielded material now preserved in the British Museum and British Library. In addition, some material survives in the Mogao caves in Dunhuang.

A Description of Tangut Dress

Prior to the establishment of the Tangut Empire in 1038, the Tanguts appear to have dressed in materials typical of steppe nomads, favoring those made from the animals they herded. The Jiu Tang shu describes: “Men and women wore coarse cloth (he 糟) and furs, and draped felt [about their shoulders].” These materials were signifiers of difference from the “Han” mode of dress, and more specifically indicated clothing of the steppe nomads in Chinese historical sources. In the Song shi we read of a (likely apocryphal) conversation between Li Yuanhao (李元昊), who would become the first
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170 This mission, the objects found on it, and maps of the area covered are described in a multivolume work, Aurel Stein, Innermost Asia: A detailed report of explorations in Central Asia, Kan-su, and Eastern Iran carried out and described under the orders of H.M Indian government, vol. 5 (New Dehli: Cosmo, 1981).

emperor, Jingzong (景宗 r. 1038-1048), of the Tanguts, and his father, Li Deming (李得明), wherein Deming proposes adopting some of the jin (錦 “brocades”) and qi (綺 figured silks) that he has seen the Song military officials wearing. Yuanhao dismisses this idea, arguing that the traditional materials of the Tanguts are leather and wool based, and that as military men they had no use for these finer materials. Whether we choose to believe that Yuanhao really rejected Chinese style silks for the wool and leather-based clothing of the steppe nomads, we know that silks were worn in the Tangut empire during his reign. The Song shi informs us that it was during his reign period that official dress was regulated, and “Han” style and Tangut (the Song shi calls it “foreign” fan 番) style clothing was distinguished. The former was worn by officials, while the latter by the military; this is perhaps the basis for attributing this comment from Yuanhao to his father. The informal dress (bianfu 便服) of officials was a “purple xuan (旋) [full-length robe] with embroidered rosettes and floral patterns and a tie belt,” while common people wore green.

Representations of Male Dress

Possible representations of this common green robe are in depiction of musicians and entertainers at the lower right corner of a large hand scroll, Guanyin, Moon in Water, from Khara Khot and now in the collection of the Hermitage (fig. 1.44). These figures

172 SS, juan 485, “Record of the Xia Kingdom” (夏國上), 13,393.
173 “便服則紫紗　地織錦子花旋繚，束帶” SS, juan 485, “Record of the Xia Kingdom” (夏國上), 13,393.
wear simple, narrow-sleeved robes that fall to the mid-calf, belted at the waist with a tie-belt, with leather boots showing beneath the robe, and a white undershirt or robe visible at the cuffs and collar. The robe appears to have a slit in the back to facilitate movement. The donor, shown at the lower left of the painting (fig. 1.45) also wears a green robe, though his is clearly of higher quality and shows a pattern of large roundels or rosettes, possibly in gold. His robe also has wide sleeves, and is generally ampler. White trousers are tucked into leather boots under the robe, and at the waist, which is belted, white sashes hang from either side, possibly in the style of the sash (shou) showing rank. His tall black hat ties under his chin and appears to have a metallic decoration on the front. It may correspond to a type of hat described in the same section of the Song shi cited above: “Those with a military post wore a hat with metal on it called an “engraved” (lou 鏤) hat.”

A more detailed rendition of a similarly clad man is found in a woodblock print of an official and a servant from Khara Khoto also in the collection of the Hermitage (fig. 1.46). In the catalogue, Lost Empire of the Silk Road: Buddhist Art from Khara Khoto (X-XIIIth century), Maria Rudova describes the official as wearing a green robe, though it is unclear from the reproduction that this print has any color on it; it appears to be black and white. Regardless, it seems to be of the same sort as the one worn by the donor in Guanyin, Moon in Water. Here, we can see a number of interesting details. First, the

174 “武職則冠金帖起雲鏤冠，銀帖間金鏤冠” SS, juan 485, “Record of the Xia Kingdom” (夏國上), 13,393.
official sits in a chair and wears delicate black shoes rather than the boots worn in *
Guanyin, Moon in Water*. The style of the tall hat is apparent, and clearly has a floral
decoration. The robe has a high, round collar with the under-robe visible beneath it. The
belt sits high on the waist, and does not appear to be in the tie-belt style. The large
roundels appear to be highly stylized dragons (the face of the dragon is visible in the
center of the pattern). This gives us some indication of the status of the wearer, as we
know from the legal code, *Tiansheng gaijiu xinding lüling*:

> Imperial relatives, greater and lesser officials, [Buddhist] monks, Taoist masters,
> and others, both male and female are all alike restricted from wearing bird’s foot
> yellow (mineral yellow), bird’s foot crimson (mineral red), apricot yellow,
> decorative embroidery and gold designs with the sun and moon, as well as dress
> woven with decorations in one color, with the sun and the moon, as well as mixed
> colors with dragon roundels.\(^{176}\)

This official must have been of some importance to be granted permission to wear a
pattern with dragon roundels.

A clearer representation of a robe with dragon roundels is in a depiction of an
imperial donor in Mogao cave 409 in Dunhuang (fig. 1.47), from the middle Tangut
period.\(^ {177}\) Formerly identified as a Uighur donor, recent scholars have determined that
this is in fact a representation of a Tangut emperor.\(^ {178}\) The confusion with Uighur dress is
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\(^{176}\) Shi Jinbo et al., *Tiansheng gaijiu xinding lüling*, no. 7, 282.

\(^{177}\) *WSWG*, 116.

\(^{178}\) See Shi Jinbo, “Xixia xingshi he Dunhuang gaoku chuyi,” *Xixia xue*, vol. 4 (July, 2009), 167;
not misplaced; we know that Uighurs lived in Tangut territory, and Susan Huang has pointed out their important role in helping to shape Tangut visual culture as well as their patronage of Tangut-produced sutras.\footnote{Susan Huang, “Reassessing Printed Buddhist Frontispieces from Xi Xia,” 140.} In addition, the tiara worn by the Tangut emperor is very similar to Uighur examples, and the cut of the robe and belt and its accessories are similar to the front-closing robes depicted on Uighur donors. The depiction of the tiara in this Tangut context is another example of the tiara, associated with the Uighurs, also worn in the Tang dynasty. The lack of visible hair and the patterns of the robe indicate that the donor depicted is not Uighur. The donor’s black robe is ankle length, with a high round collar and narrow sleeves. It is patterned with large dragon roundels of which eleven are visible. Since the motif appears symmetrical there is probably a twelfth roundel on the donor’s right side. The robe has a slit up the left side, revealing a green lining and white knee-high boots. This figure is identified as the Tangut emperor by the decoration of his robe and the canopy and fans carried by the attendants that follow behind him wearing simpler green and blue robes with foliate repeat patterns on them.\footnote{Chen Gaohua and Xu Jijun, Zhongguo fushi tongshi, 38.} We read in the Tiansheng gaijiu xinding lüling, “When the emperor comes to present at the hall, the holder of the umbrella must hold the umbrella carefully for the duration of the presentation.”\footnote{Shi Jinbo et al., Tiansheng gaijiu xinding lüling number 12, 431.} In front of the emperor is a miniature person who wears a tiara and robe very similar to that of the emperor, although lacking dragon roundels. Chen
Gaohua and Xu Jijun identify this person as the heir apparent, which is possible, but without cartouches identifying the figures we cannot know for certain.\footnote{182}

As with Liao, Song, and Jin dress, the Tangut emperor had a variety of dress styles available to him, depending on the occasion and season. We lack a systematic description of these different types of dress, however. Based on the titles of chapters and sections of contemporary category books in Chinese that describe Tangut dress, Chen Gaohua and Xu Jijun identify the imperial dragon roundel robe as a type of formal dress (\textit{fafu} 法服);\footnote{183} certainly it was deemed appropriate for ceremonial occasions, as evidenced by the imperial donor in Mogao cave 409. However, Chen and Xu are quick to jump to the conclusion that Tangut clothing adheres to the same system as Chinese clothing, based on the fact that familiar Chinese terms for types of dress were used in these (Chinese language) books. We should try to approach Tangut dress without the imposed Chinese labels, as these come with an inevitable set of expectations for the form and use of the dress.

Another depiction of imperial dress is found in a picture from a scroll unearthed in Khara Khoto, now in the collection of the National Library of Beijing, \textit{Xixia Translating Sutras (Xixia yi jing tu 西夏譯經圖)} (fig. 1.48). Chen and Xu identify the dress worn by Emperor Huizong (r. 1067-1086) and his mother, the Empress Dowager Biangzhi, as another type of \textit{fafu}.\footnote{184} In the picture, the two principle figures, identified

\footnote{182 Chen Gaohua and Xu Jijun, \textit{Zhongguo fushi tongshi}, 383.}
\footnote{183 Citing Shi Jinbo \textit{Xixia wenhua}, see Chen Gaohua and Xu Jijun, \textit{Zhongguo fushi tongshi}, 382, footnote 5.}
\footnote{184 Chen Gaohua and Xu Jijun, \textit{Zhongguo fushi tongshi}, 383.}
by cartouches, sit facing each other. The emperor wears an ample robe with wide sleeves that closes to the right, creating a v-neck. The robe has decorations on the shoulders and the skirt, though this is partially covered by a bixi-style apron skirt. He wears a wide girdle, which appears to have floral decorations, and a pointed crown also with floral decorations.

A different type of imperial dress may be depicted in a painting, now lost, found in Khara Khoto by Koslov (fig. 1.49). The painting, called *Portrait of a Tangut Emperor* in the Russian archives, shows a large seated figure flanked by an entourage, including a concubine, a military official, and a falconer.\(^\text{185}\) He wears a tall black hat of the sort worn by the official in the woodblock print discussed above (fig. 1.46). The black and white reproduction is of poor quality, although the general cut of the robe of the central figure is quite easy to make out. It is a full-length white robe with a high, round collar, narrow sleeves, worn with a dark belt. Kira Fyodorovna Samosyuk writes that the robe has a “barely visible ring motif,” which may give further evidence for a preference for large roundels as a decorative motif for textiles used by the Tangut elite.\(^\text{186}\) This robe, however, is much simpler in design than the previous two. Chen and Xu hypothesize that it may correspond to a description of Yuanhao’s robe, mentioned above, based on its color and narrow sleeves.\(^\text{187}\) The description of this robe in the *Song shi* is indeed quite vague. It says only that the white, narrow-sleeved robe was first worn during the reign of Yuanhao,
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\(^\text{185}\) Kira Fyodorovna Samosyuk, “The Art of the Tangut Empire; A Historical and Stylistic Interpretation,” in Piotrovsky, *Lost Empire of the Silk Road*, 85.

\(^\text{186}\) Samosyuk, “The Art of the Tangut Empire,” 85.

and was worn with a felt hat lined with red, with red pendants hanging from the back.\textsuperscript{188}

We have no way of knowing if this is a depiction of an emperor, or simply of a very high-ranking official. Nonetheless, we now have some idea of the variety of robes suitable for representations of the male Tangut elite.

**Non-Imperial Male Donors**

In addition to representations of the Tangut elite in portrayals of donors, there are several examples of non-imperial donors from the material uncovered at Khara Khoto. Donors are depicted in three such paintings in the collection of the Hermitage: *Amitabha Appearing before Worshippers* (fig. 1.50), *Usnisavijaya Mandala* painted on wood (fig. 1.51), and *Greeting the Soul of the Righteous Man on the Way to the Pure Land of Amitabha* painted on linen. The male figures in the first two paintings are clad in similar full-length robes that close in front, with medium-wide sleeves, high, round collars, and belts buckled at the waist. The donor in *Amitabha Appearing before Worshippers* holds a censer and wears a brown robe with a barely visible pattern of six-petal flowers, providing more evidence for robes with a repeat pattern of roundel-style motifs. The donor in *Greeting the Soul of the Righteous Man on the Way to the Pure Land of Amitabha* wears an equally simple, but slightly different, robe. This robe has a V-neck, and is not belted. It is dark red-brown with roundels with vegetal motifs, yet another variation of the roundel pattern. The wrists and collar have a simple, monochrome border.

\textsuperscript{188}“始衣白窄衫，氈冠紅裏，冠頂後垂紅結纕” *SS, juan* 485, “Record of the Xia Kingdom” (夏國上), 13393.
In all three depictions, the white under-robe is visible at the collar and the wrists. All three figures have the standard hairstyle of Tangut men referred to in Chinese as tufa (禿髪). This hairstyle consisted of a tonsure in the front of the head, with the hair allowed to hang down the back and in front of the ears, and is quite distinctive, and reminiscent of the Khitan kunfa.

**Female Dress**

There are fewer examples of female Tangut dress than male dress. One representation is of imperial dress is the portrayal of the Empress Dowager Biangzhi from the *Xixia Translating Sutras*, discussed above in relation to Emperor Huizong’s dress (fig. 1.48). In this portrayal, the empress is seated, holding a censer, and wearing an elaborate crown, called a “phoenix crown” by Chen Gaohua and Xu Jijun. Her robe is as voluminous as that of her son, with wide sleeves, and a V-neck that closes on the right. The robe appears to be monochrome, though a shou-type sash hangs down the front with a pattern of circular motifs or perhaps pearls.

Examples of non-imperial female dress are found in devotional pictures such as those discussed above regarding non-imperial male dress. Three examples are in the Hermitage: the female donor in *Amitabha Appearing before Worshippers* (fig. 1.52), the female donor on the lower left of the pair of the *Usnisavijaya Mandala* discussed above (fig. 1.53), and two female donors depicted on the lower right of a silk hanging scroll of a
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painting of Guanyin (fig. 1.54). The Guanyin donors are identified by cartouches on boards placed slightly behind them on the platform going up to the seated Guanyin figure. These inscriptions cannot be made out in the reproductions, but according to Rudova, they read “the peachwood board of the Bai family” and “the bride from the Gao family is burning incense.”

All the women wear similar robes, which are inevitably red but come in a variety of hues. The robes fit snugly, with narrow sleeves, slits up both sides, and a v-neck that closes on the left. Their borders are monochrome, and the white under-robe shows at the side slits, wrists, and collar. All the robes are decorated with a simple floral or foliate repeat pattern which is vaguely lozenge shaped, rather than the round patterns we find on male robes. Although the ears of the women in the Guanyin painting are covered by their hair, in the other portrayals we see that the women wear earrings. The women all wear their hair partially up in a topknot or high chignon, with some of the hair allowed to hang down loosely at the neck. The topknot is in each example is covered and held in place with decorative bands in either red or gold. This hairstyle is as distinct as the male tufa, and clearly sets these women apart from their Uighur, Khitan, and Jurchen contemporaries.

**Textile Production**

I am not aware of any examples of textiles that can be definitely attributed to Tangut production. One robe in the collection of Chris Hall, presently on loan to the
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190 Rudova in Piotrovsky, *Lost Empire of the Silk Road*, 206.
Asian Civilizations Museum in Singapore, has a Liao dynasty date and is thought to have been used by a Uighur, rather than a Khitan, and is made of Liao samite (fig. 1.5).\(^1\) This hypothesis is based solely on the cut of the robe, which, though certainly of a type worn by Uighurs (at least according to donor portrayals of the central front-closing robe), was also worn by Tanguts, with a front left side closing, high round collar, narrow sleeves, a flaring skirt, and a back slit to facilitate movement. In addition, the design of the robe shows a repeat pattern of floral roundels surrounded by a pearl roundel border and small eight-petaled flowers in the interstices. Based on the examples of Uighur dress and Tangut dress examined here, the textile pattern of this robe appears to be more in the Tangut style than the Uighur style. As noted above, there was a strong connection between Tangut and Uighur visual culture and without excavated examples from Tangut territory to compare this robe with it must remain in the ambiguous territory between the Khitan, Uighur, and Tangut cultures.

We know from the *Tiansheng gaijiu xinding lüling* texts that silk was woven in the Tangut Empire. An official center for silk weaving (*zhijuan yuan* 織綢院) was established.\(^2\) In addition, there were official storehouses dedicated to the storage of clothing (*yifu ku* 衣服庫), wool and leather goods (*pimao ku* 皮毛庫), and silks and satins (*chouduan ku* 織綢庫).\(^3\) We also learn that there was a “leather and fur sector” (皮衣

---


\(^2\) Shi Jinbo et al., *Tiansheng gaijiu xinding lüling* number 17, 531.

\(^3\) Shi Jinbo et al., *Tiansheng gaijiu xinding lüling* number 17, 532.
房), and “sewing craftsmen” (cailiang jiang 裁量匠) in the inner palace. The latter probably referred to the tailors who made clothing for the emperor and his family.

Conclusion

This survey of the clothing of four different peoples, all of whom can be considered precursors in some way to the Mongols, shows the complexity of attempting a categorization and definition of non-“Han” Chinese clothing in the ninth to thirteenth centuries. Indeed, this survey is incomplete owing to the lack of original material surviving from this time. However, as we move onto the Mongol material, we shall return to the form and function of dress in these pre-Mongol empires in attempts to shed light on various types of dress and their use in court and ceremonial contexts during the Mongol period.

194 Shi Jinbo et al., *Tiansheng gaijiu xinding lüling* number 12, 427.
Chapter 2: Early Mongol Dress (1206-1259)

This initial chapter on Mongol dress will cover the period from the confederation of Mongol groups under Chinggis Khan (c. 1162-1227) in 1206, until 1260, the year that Khubilai Khan (r. 1260-1294) came to power. In it, we will explore the emergence of a courtly vocabulary that, in the Yuan dynasty, properly became codified as a kind of “vestimentary system.” Here, we will look at the adoption of new textiles, motifs, and forms of dress that would become loaded with political, ethnic, and social significance as the Mongol Empire developed in the first half of the thirteenth century.

In this chapter and the next, the term “Mongol” refers to a confederation of diverse groups, mostly of Turkic origin, from the steppe region of present-day Mongolia and parts of North China. There are many similarities between early Mongol clothing and costume of the Yuan dynasty, however, Khubilai’s ascent to power marks a natural break between the formative and state-building stages of the Mongol Empire. From 1206 to about 1260 the Mongol Empire was relatively united under the khans who ruled from the capital in Karakorum; after 1260, four major and autonomous khanates emerged which were in some cases, actively hostile to one another. The early period was also a time of

---

195 I borrow the term “vestimentary system,” from Roland Barthes’ “fashion system.” Barthes uses semiotics to analyze the fashion of a specific period, seeing fashion as a social system based upon convention. See Roland Barthes, Systeme de la mode (Paris: Éditions de Seuil, 1967), especially 19. See also Roland Barthes, “Historie et sociologie du vêtement: Quelques observations méthodologiques,” Annales. Historie, Sciences Sociales, 12e Année, No. 3 (Jul. – Se, 1957), 435-437. “Fashion” did not exist in the pre-modern period as such, however, clothing and textiles created meaning that could be read by people within a given society.

196 The division of the Mongol Empire after the death of Chinggis Khan is complicated. A simplified explanation of the post-Chinggisid period is that Chinggis Khan divided the territory that he had conquered into four khanates or uluses [the Mongolian term] among the four sons he had by his principal wife, Börte. Jochi (d. 1226/7) received the area in Russia and the Steppe that became known as the Golden Horde; Chaghatai (d. 1242) was granted a large area in Central Asia known as the Chaghatai Khanate; Ögödei (d. 1241) succeeded Chinggis as Great Khan in the area of Northern China (all of the territories held by the Jin
transition, when the Mongols were shifting from a nomadic life on the steppe to rulers over increasingly large portions of sedentary civilizations. During this period they adopted traditions of dress from the groups discussed in the first chapter, as well as textiles and patterns from Central Asia, and they incorporated these with their own costume and aesthetic preferences to create a truly hybrid dress system. Khubilai built upon the use of textiles in court ceremonial and ritual when he eventually founded the Yuan dynasty; therefore, a thorough understanding of the first half of the thirteenth century is imperative in order to approach Yuan court dress. Although the official history of the Yuan records that Möngke Khan first wore “imperial dress” (gunmian 袞冕) in 1252, it was only under Yuan Chengzong (成宗 Temür Khan, r. 1294-1307) that clothing was first codified and even later, during the reign of Yuan Renzong (仁宗 Buyantu Khan, r. 1285-1320), that sumptuary regulations were enacted. These regulations applied to textiles, materials, and patterns rather than the form of dress.

and Song would eventually be incorporated into this khanate); and Tolui (d. 1232) was given an area in the Asian Steppe including present-day Mongolia. Due to internal fighting among Chiggis’s descendants, especially after the death of Ögödei (Great Khan, r. 1229-1241), there was some reorganization and fracturing of these territories by the time that Möngke (Great Khan, r. 1251-1259), a son of Tolui (1192-1232), emerged as the fourth ruler and Great Khan. In oversimplified terms, the Chaghatai Khanate and Golden Horde, though ruled by descendants of Chiggis Khan, basically splintered from the central authority of the Great Khan. Möngke Khan put his brother Khubilai (Great Khan, r. 1260-1294) in charge of campaigns in China, and his other brother Hülegü (Ilkhan, r.1256-1265) in charge of campaigns in Persia. Khubilai would go on to found the Yuan dynasty and Hülegü would found the Ilkhanate. These two khanates were therefore the only ones that had cordial relations and regular exchange. It should also be noted that in recent decades, scholars of the Mongol Empire have rejected the idea of a straightforward division of the four khanates, arguing for a greater number of autonomous uluses. For a thorough explanation of the ulus system and its complexities see Peter Jackson, “From Ulus to Khanate: the Making of the Mongol States c. 1220-c. 1290,” in Reuven Amitai-Preiss and David O. Morgan, eds., The Mongol Empire and Its Legacy (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 12-38.

197 Song Lian, Yuan shi, (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1976), juan 78, 1935.
198 YS, juan 78, 1942-1943. The same passage is found in Tongzh i tiaoge, juan 9, in Yuandai shiliao congkan (Series of Yuan Materials and History), (Zhejiang: Zhejiang guji chuban she, 1986), 134-137.
Sources

Textual and material sources from the early Mongol period that give us information about dress are, compared to Liao, Jin, Tangut, and Uighur materials, relatively numerous. Parts of the Secret History of the Mongols, the Mongol-authored history of Chinggis Khan and his sons, reveal the importance of textiles to the early Mongols. The standard history of the Yuan dynasty, the Yuan shi (元史), compiled in 1370, while criticized, especially for the pre-Yuan period, nonetheless provides us with basic information about the foundation of textile workshops, ceremonial and ritual dress, and court dress more generally. Other histories that help our understanding of this early period are the Tarikh-i jahan gusha (History of the World Conqueror) by the historian Juvayni (1223-1286), and the section on the founding of the Mongol Empire in the Jami‘ al-tawarikh (Compendium of Chronicles) by the high-ranking Ilkhanid court official Rashid al-Din (c. 1247-1318). These histories are supplemented by travel

199 See Igor de Rachewiltz (translator and annotator), Secret History of Mongols (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2004), Section 238, 163.
201 Juvayni, ‘Ala’ al-Din ‘Ata Malek, The History of the World-Conqueror, translated from the text of Mirza Muhammad Qazvini by John A. Boyle (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1997). Jami‘ al-tawarikh has been translated into European languages several times, for example: Rashiduddin Fazlullah,
accounts by Song subjects and European travelers. Chinese reports include *Changchun zhenren xiyou ji*（長春真人西遊記, translated by Arthur Waley as *Travels of an Alchemist*), by Li Zhichang (李志常) recounting the voyage of Qiu Chuji (丘處機, 1148-1227), also known as Changchun (長春), an early proponent of the Quanzhen (全真) sect of Daoism, to Chinggis Khan's court in 1221; *Meng da bei lu*（蒙鞑備錄）by Zhao Hong (趙珙) from 1221; and *Heida shilüe*（黑鞑事略）by Peng Daya (彭大雅) and Xu Ting (徐霆) recording a 1237 journey. European travel records dating to the period before 1260 include Julian of Hungary, whose account *Epistola de vita Tartarorum* dates to 1237, John of Plano Carpini (Italian: Giovanni da Pian del Carpine, c. 1182-1252), who was sent to Karakorum by Pope Innocent IV and published his *Ystoria mongolorum* in 1247; and the Flemish friar William of Rubruck (c. 1220-1293), unofficially backed by King

---

202 Li Zhichang’s account of Qiu Chuji’s journey has been translated several times into European languages, here I use Arthur Waley’s translation, Li Chih-Ch’ang [Li Zhichang], *The Travels of an Alchemist: The Journey of the Taoist Ch’ang Ch’un from China to the Hindukush at the Summons of Chingiz Khan*, Arthur Waley (trans.), (London: George Routledge & Sons, Ltd., 1979). Zhao Hong’s *Meng da bei lu* has been edited in Chinese, see Meng Gong (孟珙) (ed.). Taipei: Yiwen yinshuguan yinxing, 1965. Peng Daya and Xu Ting’s *Heida shilüe* has been edited in Chinese, see the edition published in Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1995. Both *Heida shilüe* and *Meng da bei lu* have been translated into German. See Ernst Haenisch and Yao Ts’ung-wu (trans. and eds.), *Meng-ta pei-lu und hei-ta shih-lüeh* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1980).

203 Julian of Hungary’s account, one of the earliest Western accounts of the Mongols, unfortunately contains nothing about dress and will therefore not be used here. The text of Julian of Hungary is translated and annotated in German by H. Dörrie, "Drei Texte zur Geschichte der Ungarn und Mongolen: Die Missionsreisen des fr. Julianus O. ins Ural-Gebiet (1234/5) und nach Russland (1237) und der Bericht des Erzbischofs Peter über die Tartaren," *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen Philologisch-Historische Klasse*, vol. 6, 1956, 165-182.
Louis IX of France, and whose *Itinera* of 1255 is perhaps the most detailed of these sources.\(^{204}\)

Remains of Mongol textiles from 1206-1260 were excavated at the burial complex of the Wanggu clan at Mingshui, Damaoqi in Inner Mongolia in 1978 and have been dated and studied by Zhao Feng and Xia Hexiu.\(^{205}\) More textile remains have been found at the Yin mountain burial site of the Wanggu clan in Siziwangqi, Inner Mongolia.\(^{206}\) Other textile and clothing remnants from this period were found in the tomb of the monk Haiyun (1203-1257) at the twin pagodas in the Qingshou Monastery in


For a list of all the missions (minus Marco Polo) that went between Europe and Asia during the Mongol period, see L. Bressan, “Odoric of Pordenone (1265-1331). His vision of China and South-East Asia and his contribution to relations between Asia and Europe,” *Journal of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, vol. 70, No. 2 (273) (1997), 6-8.

\(^{205}\) See Xia Hexiu (夏荷修) and Zhao Feng (趙豐), “Damaoqi Dasujixiang Mingshui mudi chutu de sizhipin” 達茂旗大蘇吉響明水墓地出土的絲織品 (Silk textiles excavated from the Mingshui cemetery in the Sasuji District in Damaoqi), *Neimenggu wenwu kaogu* 内蒙古文物考古, no. 1-2, 1992, 113-121. See also Zhao Feng, *Treasures in Silk: An Illustrated History of Chinese Textiles* (Hong Kong: ISAT/Costume Squad, 1999), especially chapters 5 and 6.

\(^{206}\) Ge Shanlin (盖山林), *Yinshan Wanggu* 阴山汪古 (The Wanggu clan of Yin Mountain) (Hohhot: Nei Menggu renmin chubanshe, 1991), especially Chapter 7, 233-269. The only photos of clothing and textiles in this publication are poor quality and black and white, although type of textile and sizes are given.
Beijing, dated 1257; and at the Jininglu cache in Inner Mongolia. Two pieces in the Cleveland Art Museum from the first half of the 13th century have been identified “Mongol” (likely produced in Central Asia) by Anne Wardwell. The David Collection in Copenhagen, the Chris Hall Collection in Hong Kong, and AEDTA in the Musée Guimet in Paris also preserve early Mongol textiles. Based on these objects and the textual descriptions, we have an idea of different textiles and forms of male dress during the pre-Yuan period. Regarding female dress, we rely for the most part on textual descriptions, which have some correspondence to pictorial evidence from the Yuan period. Female dress was conservative and does not appear to have changed substantially over the century-and-a-half in question. During the Yuan dynasty, however, we will distinguish between Mongol-style female dress and Chinese (i.e. Song) style female dress, both of which appear to have been widespread. The same is true for certain types of male robes, though who was allowed to wear them and specific types of patterns and textiles certainly shifted with regulations established during the Yuan dynasty.

Chinggis Khan confederated the Mongols at the khuriltai of 1206, where he was declared supreme leader of the Mongols. Before invading the Jin state in 1211 (the Jin

---

207 Beijing shi wenhuaju wenwu diaocha yanjiu zu (Beijing City Cultural Bureau Cultural Relic Investigation and Research Team), “Beijing Shuangta Qingshousi chutu de simian zhipin ji xiuhua” (Silk and cotton textiles excavated from Shuangta Qingshousi Temple in Beijing and their embroidered designs), Wenwu ziliao cankao 9 (1958): 29; Zhao Feng, Ch. 7: “Silk Artistry of the Yuan dynasty,” in Chinese Silks, 333.

208 Pan Xingrong, “Yuan Jininglu gucheng chutu de jiaocang sizhipin ji qita” (Silk and other objects excavated from the Yuan hoard at Jininglu), Wenwu 8, (1979) 32-35 for details and photos of the clothing excavated; Li Yiyou, “Tan Yuan Jininglu yizhi churu de sizhipin” (On the silk textiles excavated from the Yuan site at Jininglu), Wenwu 8 (1979), 37-39 for developments in silk weaving during the Yuan dynasty; Zhao Feng, “Silk Artistry of the Yuan dynasty” (2012), 333, also figs. 7.13a, b, 7.17a, b, 7.23a, b.

did not fall to the Mongols until 1234), Chinggis made sure to incorporate as many peoples from the steppe region as possible, including as the Nestorian Öngguts, into the burgeoning Mongol empire. In addition, he recruited Jurchens, Khitans, and Chinese who had served the Jin, into his forces. The most famous of these Jin recruits was Yelü Chucai (耶律楚材 1189-1244), descended on his father’s side from the Yelü royal family of the Liao dynasty. Yelü Chucai was recruited sometime after 1218, and became a high-level administrator under the Mongols, sometimes even described as “prime minister.” He was responsible for a number of influential reforms during the reigns of both Chinggis and Ögödei Khan. It was likely due to highly placed administrators such as Yelü Chucai, familiar with the customs of the peoples being conquered by the Mongols (in this case Song and the Jin), that the Mongols were able to transition so easily between their nomadic lifestyle and rule over well-established cultures in China and Persia.


211 See the description of Yelü Chucai’s recruitment in the YS, juan 146, 3455-3456: In 1218 (the second year of Zhenyou 貞祐二年), impressed by Chucai’s height of 8 chi, his magnificent voice, and beautiful beard, Chinggis asked Chucai to come serve him. Chucai asked Chinggis how he could be expected to leave service to the Jin where both he and his father had been officials. Chucai soon overcame his objections, however, since he took part in the campaigns in Khwarazm (the “western Muslims” 帝西討回國) the following year. Paraphrased from YS, juan 146, 3455-3456.

212 He is referred to as such in the first colophon appended to Poem of Farewell to Liu Man, written by Song Lian (宋濂 1310-1381), the editor of the Yuan shi. See the translation of the colophon on the website of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, Collections, Poem of Farewell to Liu Man, Yelü Chucai (Khitan, 1190-1244), http://www.metmuseum.org/collections/search-the-collections/40105?img=4. Accessed December 10, 2013.

213 Thomas Allsen has discussed the important role of “cultural brokers” in the Mongol Empire in several publications, though his focus is on exchange via people such as Bolad Aqa and Marco Polo across the...
Scholarship on the Mongol Empire in China often discusses the four types of people categorized under Mongol rule – Mongols (Menggu ren 蒙古人), “people of various kinds” (semu ren 色目人), Northerners (Han ren 漢人), and Southern Chinese (nan ren 南人). The Mongols consisted of the initial peoples confederated under Chinggis, while the makeup of the semu ren remains a source of debate for scholars. For example, in one legal case cited by Funada Yoshiyuki recorded in the Yuan dianzhang regarding the tattooing of criminals, Uighurs, Muslims, Naimans, and Tanguts were counted among the semu ren while Jurchens and Khitans were considered Han ren. If Funada is correct, this did not preclude Jurchens, Khitans, and Chinese from holding high-ranking office; although Yelü Chucai held office prior to this ruling (which occurred in the Yuan dynasty). We should perhaps follow Paul Buell’s assessment of already established Mongol khanates. See Thomas Allsen, Commodity and Exchange in the Mongol Empire (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 63-71; Culture and Conquest in Mongol Eurasia (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 71; “Biography of a Cultural Broker. Bolad Ch’eng-Hsiang in China and Iran,” in Raby and Fitzherbert (eds.), The Court of the Il-khans 1290-1340 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 7-19; and “Two Cultural Brokers of Medieval Eurasia: Bolad Aqa and Marco Polo,” in Gervers and Schlepp (eds.), Nomadic Diplomacy: Destruction and Religion from the Pacific to the Adriatic (Toronto, 1994), 63-78.

214 Funada Yoshiyuki, shows the confusion that existed throughout the Mongol period as to what constituted a semu ren in “The Image of the Semu People: Mongols, Chinese, and Various Other Peoples under the Mongol Empire,” unpublished paper given at “Mobility and Transformations: Economic and Cultural Exchange in Mongol Eurasia,” held at the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, July 2014. This paper was based on Funada, Yoshiyuki 舩田善之, 1999, “Genchō chika no Shikimoku-jin ni tsuite.” 「元朝治下の色目人について」 [“Se-mu-ren under the Yuan Dynasty.”] Shigaku zashi 『史学雑誌』, 108/9 and Funada, Yoshiyuki 舩田善之, “Semu-ren yu Yuandai zhidu shehui: Chongxin tantaotou menggu Semu Hanren Nanren huafen de weizhi.” (色目人与元代制度・社会—重新探讨蒙古·色目·汉人、南人划分的位置. “Semu People and the System and Society in the Yuan: Re-examining the Classification of the Mongols, Semu, Hanren and Nanren.”) Mengguxue Xinxi (蒙古学信息, Mongolian Studies Information), 91.


216 Paul Buell questions whether Yelü Chucai “was too sincicized to qualify as a genuine representative of the frontier zone.” Paul D. Buell, “Činqai,” in Igor de Rachewiltz et al (eds.), In the Service of the Khan:
the assortment of peoples who helped run the Mongol Empire, whom he terms the “steppe intelligentsia.” The defining aspect for this designation was ethnic origins in a semi-nomadic steppe society where “native, Chinese, and other elements interacted freely…if the Mongol empire, as a total system, seems to be politically heterogeneous in many respects, that feature can be taken as an expression of the hybrid character proper to the steppe intelligentsia itself.” In other words, it is important to keep in mind that the Mongol Empire contained great cultural and ethnic diversity. As we will see, the role of certain of these groups was especially important in establishing courtly practices and an aesthetic vocabulary during this formative period.

Textile Types and Their Production Sites

Early visitors to Mongol encampments describe the form and fabrics of Mongol dress. As was the case with many steppe nomads, they wore clothing made from animal products such as leather, felt, and fur. Li Zhichang observed during his 1221 visit to Chinggis’ court, “Their clothes are made of hides and fur; they live on meat and curdled milk. The men wear their hair in two plaits that hang behind the ears.” The description of this coif recalls both male Khitan hairstyles (kunfa 髭) that we saw depicted in court paintings and tomb murals in the previous chapter, and the Tangut tufa (.getXF).

Finer materials, such as silk and plant-based textiles, were also worn during the pre-Yuan

---

Eminent Personalities of the Early Mongol-Yüan Period (1200-1300), Asiatische Forschungen, 121 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1993), 96
Buell, “Činqai,” 95, 96.
Li Chih-Ch’ang [Li Zhichang], The Travels of an Alchemist, 67.
period, although production increased after the founding of the Yuan dynasty. Peng Daya and Xu Ting observed, “Their clothes overlap to the right and have a square collar; in old times used felt, furs, and leather, and in present time use ramie, silk, and gold thread, and for colors use red, purple, maroon, and green, which they pattern with the sun, the moon, dragons, and phoenixes. They do not have distinctions of noble and base ranks in their clothing.” Excavated material confirms that luxurious fabrics were in demand by the Mongol court, and that they were produced specifically for court use in the pre-imperial Mongol period.

Many of the weaves known to us from the Jin dynasty, including kesi, figured silk textiles, and silk tabby with patterns in gold and silver gilded threads woven using a supplementary weft, continued to be produced in the Mongol period. However, the most striking fabric characteristic of the Mongol period was nasūj, an Arabic word transcribed as nashishi (納失失／納石失) in Chinese, a silk textile with a continuous overall pattern in gold or on plain ground with an offset motif in gold.  

---


supplementary decorative weft is held in place by a binding warp. As “brocaded” fabrics may refer to those textiles popular from the Liao and Jin dynasties (and which continued to be produced in the Mongol period) with repeat patterns of animals and plants woven using a supplementary metallic weft on a tabby or twill ground, or any textile woven with a colorful supplementary weft, we see once more why the term “brocade” is so problematic. It is important to distinguish between the tabby or twill ground silks woven with repeat patterns in a supplementary gold weft (called “gilded silk,” *jin duanzi* in Chinese), and lampas weave textiles with an all-over gold pattern that will be referred to here as *nasī*. Zhao Feng adds a third category of gold textiles produced in the Mongol period, gold weft-faced compound *jin* (*錦 “brocade”) weave in tabby or twill, what he calls *anjiaxing zhijinjin* (*暗夾型織金錦*) in Chinese. This third category distinguishes textiles woven with a lampas weave from textiles lacking a binding warp. For our purposes, we will note the difference between lampas-woven *nasī* and brocaded *anjiaxing zhijinjin* when we have specifics about the weave structure of particular pieces, but we will treat them together under the broader heading of *nasī* as questions about their production, use, and decoration generally overlap.

---

223 Dorothy Burnham defines lampas as “a figured weave in which a pattern, composed of weft floats bound by a binding warp, is added to a ground weave formed by a main warp and main weft. The ground weave is variable. The weft threads forming the pattern may be main, pattern, or brocading wefts; they float on the face as required by the pattern, and are bound by the ends of the binding warp in a binding which is ordinarily tabby or twill and is supplementary to the ground weave.” Dorothy Burnham, *Warp and Weft*, 82; See also Dieter Kuhn, *Chinese Silks*, 525.

224 Zhao Feng, “Silk Artistry of the Yuan dynasty,” 334.

225 Zhao Feng, “Silk Artistry of the Yuan dynasty,” 334.
Where the Mongols acquired their *nasīj* during this early period is worth considering. Archaeological evidence shows that pre-Yuan Mongols wore it, but it is unclear where the *nasīj* used by the Mongols was produced prior to the Yuan dynasty. We know something of the weavers who made the textiles used by the Mongols; these were by and large artisans who had worked at the last Jin dynasty capital of Bianjing (present-day Kaifeng), which would have included Chinese weavers and Central Asians captured during military campaigns.\(^{226}\) The Mongols usually spared the lives of artisans when they captured cities, and as the Liao and Jin had done before them, put these artisans to work for the court. The first record of such clemency dates to the Jin campaigns in 1216 when the only Jin subjects spared were “artisans and actors.”\(^{227}\) This was a trend that continued through the thirteenth century, resulting in these captured artisans producing various luxury goods for the Mongol court.\(^{228}\) The hybrid motifs and spread of artistic techniques resulting from this policy are nowhere seen more clearly than in the manufacture of textiles woven with gold.

The use of artisans from a diversity of backgrounds immediately brought new techniques of textile production into the geographical areas historically most impacted by arts and designs of China. Under the Mongols, motifs favored by other northern groups

\(^{226}\) *YS, juan* 120, 2964. Quoted in *WSWG*, 109, note 21, 111. See also Allsen, *Commodity and Exchange*, 43.

\(^{227}\) *YS juan* 119, 2932. Quoted in Allsen, *Commodity and Exchange*, 31-32.


\(^{228}\) Yelü Chucai famously saved the lives of the people of Bianliang by arguing that the Mongols should put them to use, asking “if we obtain the land without the people, what use are we going to make of it?” This resulted in the sparing of lives of artisans. See Igor de Rachewiltz, ‘Sino-Mongol Culture Contacts in the XIII Century: A Study on Yeh-Lū Ch’u-Ts’ai’ (Australian National University, 1960), 109-111.
such as those discussed in Chapter 1, including patterns of Chinese origin, were brought into contact with designs popular in Central Asia and Persia. The exchange of decorative motifs between China and Persia and Central Asia was not new; textiles and other decorative art objects moved overland across the Silk Road(s) from the early centuries of the Common Era. Indeed, the Mongol period, though following centuries of hybrid patterns produced across Asia, stands out from these past artistic exchanges for the rapidity of absorption of designs and techniques from a wide variety of geographical locations.

The diverse origins of the artisans responsible for the production of textiles make the task of discerning the exact sites of manufacture very difficult. The majority of the techniques used in the Yuan dynasty to produce textiles patterned with a supplementary weft in gold came from either the Jin dynasty or the eastern Persian weaving traditions, two quite different locations both geographically and culturally.\(^{229}\) While the techniques used by Jin and Persian artisans to make gold thread may differ, there was no consistent way of manufacturing gold thread in either Central Asia or in West Asia.\(^{230}\) One way of making it was to apply thin layers of gold onto an animal substrate (sometimes referred to as “leather”) with an adhesive and cut this into thin strips to form “threads,” or “lamellas.”\(^{231}\) This technique was common to Central Asian and northern or Steppe gold

\(^{229}\) *WSWG*, 107.

\(^{230}\) Anne Wardwell divides Central Asian and Middle Eastern textiles woven with metallic threads into eight categories based on characteristics of the weave. See Anne E. Wardwell, “*Panni Tartarici*: Eastern Islamic Silks Woven with Gold and Silver (13\(^{\text{th}}\) and 14\(^{\text{th}}\) Centuries).” *Islamic Art* 3 (1988-1989), Appendix I, 133.

\(^{231}\) Lamella: “A flat strip of precious or base metal, or gilt or silvered leather, membrane, metal, or paper used for yarn. It may be used flat, or wound around a core.” CIETA (Centre International d’Etude des Textiles Anciens), *Vocabulary of Textile Terms* (Lyon: Publications du CIETA, 2006), 45.
thread production; we find examples of this type beginning in the Liao dynasty, and production continued through the Yuan. A related technique was to apply gold foil to a paper substrate with an adhesive and then cut it into thin strips; this was associated with Chinese gold thread production, but used in the Jin and Yuan dynasties as well. The gold and silver “lamella” could also be wrapped around a silk thread, creating round rather than flat threads, as was the case, for example, in a Mongol-era (mid-13th century) gold textile in the Cleveland Museum of Art (1990.2) showing a pattern of felines and eagles (fig. 2.1). Another section of this same textile is found in the David Collection in Copenhagen (32-1989). In her analysis of CMA 1990.2, Wardwell highlights the use of both flat and wrapped gold threads in a single area, which gives a “three-dimensional effect.” We find this technique on comparably dated textiles in the David Collection such as 4/1993, 15/1989, and 14/1992 (figs. 2.2, 2.3). Wardwell suggests that the

---

232 For example, AEDTA 3086, a tabby weave blue silk with a motif of soaring phoenixes in gold from the Jin dynasty analyzed by Marie-Hélène Guelton and Lian Liang in May, 1992, from the archives of Marie-Hélène Guelton and the AEDTA, unpublished. AEDTA 3086 appears to be identical to a piece in the Cleveland Museum of Art (1994.292), published in WSWG cat. 31, 118-119.
234 An example from the Mongol period is AEDTA 3246 which is a tabby-weave light green silk featuring a pattern of confronted birds in roundels on a dense floral background in gold (with a paper substrate); the pattern is bound by 1/5 twill weave. Analyzed by Marie-Hélène Guelton and Lian Liang in May, 1992, from the “Archives of Marie-Hélène Guelton and the AEDTA,” unpublished.
235 Wardwell also contrasts the gold threads in CMA 1990.2 with those in CMA 1989.50, pointing out that CMA 1989.50 features gold foil on a paper substrate wrapped around a silk core. Anne Wardwell, “Two Silk and Gold Textiles of the Early Mongol Period,” 362. A similar technique (gold foil on an animal substrate wrapped around a silk core) was used to form the gold threads on AEDTA 3729 according to an analysis by Donald King. “Archives of Marie-Hélène Guelton and the AEDTA,” unpublished.
technique of using two types of gold threads corresponds to mid-13\textsuperscript{th} century tents given to Hulegu described as made of “gold on gold” in Rashid al-Din’s \textit{Jami` al-tawarikh}.\textsuperscript{238}

Juvayni describes several tents made of \textit{nas\ifn{\textsuperscript{i}}\fi}: a tent erected for Ögedei on his way to a hunt by Minister Yalavach; another near Samarkand in 1255 for Hulegu by the Minister Mas’ud Beg; and a third erected by Emir Arghun on the orders of Mönke Khan for Hulegu near Tus (Iran).\textsuperscript{239} It would not be a stretch to imagine CMA 1990.2 and the David Collection pieces (4/1993, 15/1989, and 14/1992) being used as tent panels. All feature a large repeat motif and a band at the top with pseudo-calligraphic script, more suitable for hanging than being cut up to wear as a robe.

All of these textiles feature gold threads made with a gold lamella on an animal substrate. In general, gold thread on a paper substrate appears to indicate a more eastern provenance (China) for a textile while those made with an animal substrate seem to point to a western (Central or West Asia) or northern (steppe) origin. However, since exceptions are always found, we cannot determine the origin of a textile as either “China”

\textsuperscript{238} Wardwell, “Two Silk and Gold Textiles of the Early Mongol Period,” 362-363; Wardwell, \textit{“Panni Tartarici.”} 104.

“In the month of shaban in the year 653 [September, 1255], the prince arrived in Samarkand and stopped in the prairie of Kan-ghul. It was there that the emir Masud-beg erected a tent which was made of a fabric of gold on gold.” Based on Quatremèrè’s French translation: “Au mois de shaban de l’an 653, le prince arriva à Samarkand, et s’arrêta dans la prairie de Kan-ghul. Ce fut là que l’émir Masoud-beigh fit dresser une tente, formée d’un tissu d’or sur or.” Rashid al-Din, trans. Quatremèrè, 149. Thackston translates the same passage: “There, Mas’ud Beg had erected a tent of gold-spun brocade…” Rashid al-Din trans. Thackston, vol. 2, 480.

“At the beginning of the spring, Arghun Aqa prepared a tent that was fastened by a thousand nails and made of a fabric of gold on gold.” Based on Quatremèrè’s French translation: “Au commencement du printemps, Argoun-aka fit préparer une tente attachée par mille clous, et formée d’un tissu d’or sur or.” Raschid-Eldin (Rashid al-Din), 159. Thackston translates this passage: “When spring came Arghun Aqa erected a thousand-pegged tent of gold-on-gold stuff equipped with all the accoutrements of such a monarch’s court.” Rashid al-Din, trans. Thackston, 480.

\textsuperscript{239} Juvayni, 218, 612, 616. The two tents erected for Hulegu correspond with the description in Rashid al-Din cited above. See Rashid al-Din, trans. Quatremère, 149, 159; Rashid-al-Din, trans. Thackston, 480.
or “Central Asia” based on whether the gold thread on it was on a paper or animal substrate. Determining how gold thread was made alongside weaving techniques and the patterns actually portrayed on the textile, on the other hand, allow us in some cases to hypothesize on the place of production.240

Let us turn to where textiles and nasīj were produced in the pre-Yuan period. Li Zhichang describes a silk weaving center, likely located near the Upper Yenesei River in present-day Siberia,241 in his 1221 account: “numerous Chinese craftsmen are settled there, occupied in weaving fine silks, gauze, brocade, and damask.”242 This description is vague, and one cannot assume that nasīj was actually produced there, though it is not out of the question.243 This site likely refers to the city founded by the Uighur, Kereit, or

---

240 Klejd von Folsach points out the difficulty of namings a place of origin for a textile based on the type of gold thread used and the types of motifs in Kjeld von Folsach and Anne-Marie Kerblow Bernsted, Woven Treasures: Textiles from the World of Islam (Copenhagen: The David Collection, 1993), 55-57.
241 Waley in Li Chih-Ch’ang [Li Zhichang], The Travels of an Alchemist, 124, footnote 1.
242 Li Chih-Ch’ang [Li Zhichang], The Travels of an Alchemist, 124.
243 Timothy May claims that the site described by Li Zhichang (which in Waley’s translation is noted as a location near the Upper Yenisei River in Siberia) produced nasīj, citing its proximity to gold deposits in the Altai Mountains and the Yenisei River. As tempting as it is to see this as a center of early nasīj production I do not think we can make the leap from geographic proximity to gold and the production of nasīj. See Timothy May, The Mongol Conquests in World History, 217-218.
possibly Önggüt Mongol general, Chinqai (鎮 海 Zhenhai, c. 1169-1252), called Chinqai Balaqsun, “City of Chinqai.”

Another site of pre-Yuan textile production also associated with Chinqai is described in his biography in the Yuan shi. In it, we read that the textile production center in Hongzhou (弘州) was producing luxury textiles from its founding prior to 1229:

Prior to [the election of Ögödei in 1229], they gathered together young boys, young girls, and artisans from throughout the realm and established an office [ju 局] at Hongzhou. Lastly, they obtained some three hundred weavers, goldsmiths, gold textile and patterned twill and tabby weavers [zhijin qiwen gong 織金綺紋工] from the Western Regions and three hundred weavers and coarse woolen cloth-makers [zhi mao he gong 織毛褐工] from Bianjing [present-day Kaifeng], all [of whom] were attached to the Hongzhou [office]. Chinqai was ordered to hereditarily superintend [them] in that place.

---

244 Chinqai is identified as a Kereit (one of the Mongol tribes confederated by Chinggis Khan in 1206) in the Yuan shi, Arthur Waley believes it was more likely that he was a Uighur, while Buell argues that he was likely an Önggüt. Both Waley and Buell cite evidence from Travels of an Alchemist and Hei da shilüe. See Waley, “Chinkai’s origins” in Li Chih-Ch’ang [Li Zhichang], Travels of an Alchemist, 36-37. Buell points out several contradictory points in the sources, namely that he was a Nestorian Christian (rare among the Uighurs, common among the Kereits), his native language was a Turkic dialect (the Kereits spoke Mongolian), and a great familiarity with Chinese culture, seeing all of this as evidence that he was an Önggüt, “a Turkic-speaking, largely Nestorian ethnic group of the Sino-Mongolian frontier zone that played an important bridging role between Chinese and steppe culture and was to some extent Sinicized, at least in its ruling elite.” Buell in Rachewiltz et al (1993), 97.

245 Buell notes that Chinqai Balqasun is more accurately translated “granary of Chinqai.” Buell in Rachewiltz et al (1993), 100.

246 先是，收天下童男童女及工匠，置局弘州。既而得西域織金綺紋工三百餘戶，及汴京織毛褐工三百戶，皆分隸弘州，命鎮海世掌焉。定宗即位，以鎮海為先朝舊臣，仍拜 中書右丞相。薨，年八十四。YS, juan 120, 2964. This translation is based based on Thomas Allsen (1997), 43. Allsen translates zhijin qiwen gong 織金綺紋工 as “twill and figured textile weavers”, although zhijin means “gold textiles” or “textiles woven with gold” This passage is also translated in
This description does not explicitly mention the production of *nasīj*; while *zhijin* signifies textiles woven with gold, this is a general term and could signify Jin-style silks decorated with a gold supplementary weft (*jin duanzi*), gold embroidery, or *nasīj*. We know that *nasīj* was used for Mongol dress at this time from surviving textiles. It is possible that *nasīj* was not produced within China or Mongolia until the Yuan dynasty, and the *nasīj* used in dress prior to the founding of the Yuan dynasty was imported from production sites in Central Asia. However, a variety of patterns and weaves, as well as gold-woven textiles, were likely coming out of the center in Hongzhou during this early period, with its combination of Central Asian and Chinese weavers. The forcible resettlement and mixing of weavers goes some way in explaining the variety of weaves and motifs that became popular during the Mongol period. The processes of resettlement of artisans prior to and during the Yuan dynasty also go some way in explaining why the origins of *nasīj* used at the Mongol court are hard to pinpoint.

**Textiles**

Pieces of *nasīj* dating to the pre-1260 period have survived, including a complete robe.247 The most important finds dating to the early thirteenth century come from

---

247 Following Zhao Feng’s categories, this robe is technically *anjiaxing zhijinjin* as it is not lampas (it lacks a binding warp).

*WSWG*, where the authors translate *zhijin* as “gold thread”. They also point out that another interpretation of *maohe* (毛褐 translated above as “coarse woolen cloth”) relating to the term *maoge* (毛葛), still in use today which the authors define as “a fabric woven of silk warps and cotton wefts used for jackets.” See *WSWG*, Ch. 3 “Brocades of the Jin and Mongol Periods” endnote 21, 111. See also James C.Y. Watt, “A Note on Artistic Exchanges in the Mongol Empire,” in *The Legacy of Genghis Khan*, ed. Linda Komaroff and Stefano Carboni (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art; New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2002), 63-65.
Mingshui, Damaoqi, in Inner Mongolia, and are now preserved in the Inner Mongolia Museum of Archaeology in Hohhot. In this section we will look at surviving examples of early Mongol textiles including kesi, silk tabby woven with a supplementary weft in gold, nasīj, and gauze, examples of which have all been found in the Wanggu clan tombs at Mingshui and preserved elsewhere. Both the weaves and patterns used to decorate these textiles reveal something of the variety of designs used on early Mongol dress.

The hybrid patterns and motifs that characterized the textiles and decorative arts of the Mongol period derived in large part from Central Asian prototypes. Indeed, Central Asia served as a crucible for a creative blending of motifs adapted from west Asia and China and mixed with regional styles from several hundred years prior to the advent of the Mongols. Two examples of animals particularly popular first in the Jin and later in the Mongol period are the makara, a sort of dragon-fish derived from Buddhist-Hindu iconography,248 and the djeiran, a Central Asian gazelle (also known as the goitered gazelle, *Gazella subgutturosa*).249

---

248 Fredrick Bunce defines a *makara* as “a Buddhist/Hindu iconographic device. The term *makara* refers to a mythic sea monster which is sometimes called a sea-elephant and is often depicted with the head of an elephant and the body of a fish. It is also a *vahana*, a vehicle or object upon which the image of a deity sits. The *makara* is associated with water and its life force, as well as both friendly and malignant powers. In the Buddhist tradition, it is associated with *Ishvari*, *Pramoha*, *rDo-rje-kun-grags* and others. In the Hindu tradition it is associated with *Ganga*, *Rama*, *Kama* and others.” Fredrick W. Bunce, *A Dictionary of Buddhist and Hindu Iconography, Illustrated: Objects, Devices, Concepts, Rites, and Related Terms* (New Delhi: D.K. Printworld, 1997), 171-172.

249 Watt and Wardwell point out that although the *djeiran* existed as a motif as early as the seventh century in Sogdiana, it was not used as a decorative motif in China until the Jin period. See WSWG 108.

The *djeiran*, which is variously referred to as a “cow,” “antelope,” or even “rhinoceros,” is in fact a goitered gazelle (*Gazella subgutturosa*). The term is Turkic in origin. In Clauson’s *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth Century Turkish* we find that it derives from the word *yegren*: “‘Chestnut’ as
Tabby weave silks with a supplementary weft in gold (*jin duanzi*) featuring, respectively, a repeat pattern of a *djeiran* (fig. 2.4) and a coiled *makara* (fig. 2.5) were excavated at Mingshui. The *djeiran* silk is very similar to Jin silks featuring a similar repeat motif, such as a piece on red tabby ground in the Cleveland Museum of Art (1991.4), or AEDTA 3430 which features the *djeiran* on a yellow tabby ground (figs. 2.6, 2.7). The coiled *makara*, however, seems to have more in common with coiled dragon motifs, which will be discussed in detail below, than other *makara* motifs found on Mongol textiles, such as a *nasīj* piece woven with patterns in gold on paper of phoenixes, *makaras*, and flowers on a coral silk ground in the Cleveland Museum of Art (1991.5 a,b) (fig. 2.8) or two identical pieces sewn together in the David Collection (46 a-b/1992) (fig. 2.9). As in the Jin period, the *djeiran* textile from Mingshui featuring a repeat pattern on a tabby ground was probably used for a robe. The *makara* textile from Mingshui, on the other hand, likely was used as a coffin cover.

---

The colour of a horse’s coat. A Second Period loanword in Mongolian as *cegere* where it is used as a noun meaning “gazelle, *Gazella subgutturosa*”…In this meaning and in forms similar to the Mongolian it was reborrowed by various Turkish languages from Çağ[atai] onwards, but survives with its original meaning in north east Altay…[Khakas] çêgren…[south-east] Türkî çiren…[Kazax] jiren…south-central [Uzbek] jiyron; [north-west Karakalpak]; Kumyk jyren…” From Gerard Clauson, *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1972), 914.

In Redhouse the Turkic term *jęyrän* is defined as “A gazelle, an antelope, *gazella dorcas.*” James W. Redhouse, *Turkish English Lexicon* (Beirut: Librairie du Liban, 1974), 696. Thanks to Victor Mair, Ruth Meserve, John Hill, Peter Zieme, Douglas Adams, Brian Spooner, Ilya Yakubovich, and Elias Saba for help finding the source of “*djeiran*”.

250 For analysis of these objects see Zhao Feng, “Silk Artistry of the Yuan Dynasty,” 334-335; Zhao Feng and Xia Hexiu (1992), 121.


We lack analyses for the Mingshui textiles, but we have other silks dating from the period woven with a gold supplementary weft from the Musée Guimet and the Cleveland Museum of Art that have been analyzed to tell us something about the weaving techniques of this particular style in the early Mongol period.\(^{253}\) Four fragments, a blue tabby silk with a pattern of framed confronted birds in gold (AEDTA 3262) (fig. 2.10), a green tabby silk with a pattern of palmettes with scrolling motifs in gold (AEDTA 3747) (fig. 2.11), a red tabby silk with a pattern of palmettes with floral motifs in gold (AEDTA 3380) (fig. 2.12), and another red tabby silk with a pattern of palmettes with floral motifs in gold (CMA 1994.293 WSWD cat. 33) (fig. 2.13) form a group of Mongol period \textit{jin duanzi} that show patterns adopted from Central Asia or the Eastern Iranian world.\(^{254}\) These textiles all have a foundation weave in tabby, featuring a double warp, single weft, and at least one preserved selvage.\(^{255}\) They also feature supplementary pattern wefts made from a lamella of gilded animal substrate. Their pattern sizes, too are similar: AEDTA 3262 has a pattern with a height of 17 cm and a width of 14 cm; AEDTA 3747 has a pattern 17 cm by 13.5/14 cm; and AEDTA 3380 is slightly smaller with a pattern that measures 13-15 cm by 12.5 cm. The height and width of CMA 1994.293 is not given in the analysis in \textit{When Silk Was Gold}, but it greatly resembles AEDTA 3380. The double, or paired, warps used in all of these examples are said to be

\(^{253}\) Distinctions between Jin, Central Asian/Eastern Iranian, and Mongol weaving traditions of silks with a supplementary weft in gold are explained in \textit{WSWG} 107-111.

\(^{254}\) \textit{WSWG}, 109 for AEDTA 3262 and CMA 1994.293.

\(^{255}\) AEDTA 3262 was analyzed in 1992 by Marie-Hélène Guelton and Lian Liang; AEDTA 3380 was analyzed in 1994 by Marie-Hélène Guelton and Gabriel Vial; AEDTA 3747 was analyzed in 1996 by Marie-Hélène Guelton. “Archives of Marie-Hélène Guelton and the AEDTA,” unpublished.
characteristic of the “Eastern Iranian World” by the authors of When Silk Was Gold, who also note that CMA 1994.293 may have been woven at a textile production center such as Hongzhou. While this may be true, there are examples dating to the Jin period of textiles with a double warp, notably a blue silk with foundation weave in tabby with motifs of soaring phoenixes in a gold supplementary weft on animal substrate such as AEDTA 3086 (fig. 2.14) or CMA 1994.292 (fig. 2.15). Thus the double warp existed in East Asia prior to the Mongol period, so it may have been woven by either displaced Central Asian or Jin weavers, both groups known to have worked in Hongzhou.

The group of Mongol-era jin duanzi textiles are distinct from their Jin-era predecessors in both the actual form of the decorative motifs in gold, and the binding weaves used to attach the gold threads to the silk background. While the Jin period textiles consistently feature asymmetrical animal and plant motifs in a teardrop shape, the Mongol-period iterations show more of an interest in symmetry and plant and floral motifs. The increased symmetry of the designs is likely due to a greater interest in Islamic patterns via Central Asia, where we find more of a tradition of geometry and symmetry than in decorative motifs from East Asia.

The supplementary weft of this group of pieces is bound in a diversity of weaves: AEDTA 3262 has a discontinuous pattern weft bound in irregular 8-end satin with paired foundation weaves floating across the rear of the motif every 7-9 picks. AEDTA 3747

---

256 WSWG, 122.
has a discontinuous pattern weft bound in 5/1 S twill, with successive paired foundation weaves floating across the rear of the motif every 8 picks.\textsuperscript{259} AEDTA 3380 has a discontinuous pattern weft bound in derived tabby (\textit{reps lancé à liage vertical}), with paired foundation weaves floating across the rear of the motif every 6 picks.\textsuperscript{260} CMA 1994.293 has discontinuous pattern weft bound in tabby, with paired foundation weaves floating across the rear of the motif every 4 picks.\textsuperscript{261} This list demonstrates the diversity of methods used to attach the decorative supplementary weft to a plain-weave silk present in the Mongol period. These weave structures were inherited from Jin dynasty \textit{jin duanzi} silks, although it appears that the Mongol-era iterations were more complex (especially in the use of a binding weft in 8-end satin). Weavers of Jin-era textiles appear to have favored 3/1 twill weaves to bind the gold pattern weft, but there was variety even within textiles that to the naked eye appear identical. For example, the supplementary weft of CMA 1994.292, a blue tabby silk with a design of soaring phoenixes in gold (fig. 2.14), is bound in 8/1 S twill, while a comparable textile from the Guimet, AEDTA 3086 (fig. 2.15), is bound in in 3/1 S or Z twill.\textsuperscript{262} Other examples of supplementary wefts bound in 3/1 S twill weaves from Jin-era textiles include several of the textiles discussed previously: the “Swan hunt” textile fragment on green silk (fig. 1.39), the coiled dragons (fig. 1.18), both from Chapter 1, and the above-mentioned \textit{djeiran} on red silk (fig. 2.6).

\textsuperscript{259} AEDTA 3747 was analyzed in 1996 by Marie-Hélène Guelton. “Archives of Marie-Hélène Guelton and the AEDTA,” unpublished.

\textsuperscript{260} AEDTA 3380 was analyzed in 1994 by Marie-Hélène Guelton and Gabriel Vial. “Archives of Marie-Hélène Guelton and the AEDTA,” unpublished.

\textsuperscript{261} \textit{WSWG}, 123.

\textsuperscript{262} AEDTA 3086 was analyzed in 1992 by Marie-Hélène Guelton and Lian Liang, Archives of Marie-Hélène Guelton and the AEDTA, unpublished. Analysis of CMA 1994.292 in \textit{WSWG}, 118.
Kesi

*Kesi* also continued to be produced in the Mongol period. A *kesi* boot cover decorated with a pattern of flowers and leaves on purple-colored water unearthed at Mingshui shows a pattern that appears to have been widespread in northwest China and Central Asia in the 12th and 13th centuries (fig. 2.16).\(^{263}\) It has three types of flowers and leaves portrayed; one that may be either a tripartite leaf or a small bud flanked by two small leaves; a second, similarly sized, oval leaf; and a third set of larger flowers of various shapes but with several petals. We can compare the boot cover with a large *kesi* fragment from the Metropolitan Museum of Art (1997.7) showing not only the aquatic plants but also ducks on a cream background.\(^{264}\) A similar piece was found in the tomb of the monk Haiyun at the twin pagodas in the Qingshou Monastery in Beijing (dated 1257).\(^{265}\) Although there are differences between the *kesi* produced in the Central Asian/Uighur tradition and that made in Song territory, they often looked somewhat similar. For example, AEDTA 3365, in the collection of the Musée Guimet, shows a similar motif on a blue background (fig. 2.17). However, AEDTA 3365 features birds in flight rather than sitting on the surface of water; running quadrupeds; small leaves that are ovular and smooth rather than tripartite, and branches and vines rather than waves. It is quite similar to a piece in the Metropolitan Museum, 1983.105.\(^{266}\)

\(^{263}\) *WSWG*, 72.
\(^{264}\) *WSWG*, cat. 16.
\(^{265}\) Zhao Feng, *Treasures in Silk*, 165, fig. 5.04a; *WSWG*, 72, 74; Zhao Feng “Silk Artistry of the Yuan Dynasty,” 333; Beijing shi wenhuaju wenwu diaocha yanjiu zu, “Beijing Shuangta Qingshousi chutu de simian zhipin ji xiuhua,” 29.
\(^{266}\) *WSWG*, cat. 20.
In a report from 1992 detailing the objects found at Mingshui, Zhao Feng and Xia Hexiu describe the boot cover as a the type of *kesi* likely “produced in the style of *kesi* of the early Northern Song period…manufactured in the Central Plains region.”\textsuperscript{267} In his, in his later catalogue, *Treasures in Silk* (1999), Zhao Feng dates it to the Mongol period.\textsuperscript{268} Unfortunately, neither description provides a thorough analysis of the weave, so we can only speculate that it was woven in the style common to Eastern Central Asian *kesi* of this period, likely inherited from the *kesi* weaving techniques of the Khitan and Uighurs. A technical analysis of a similar piece from the Metropolitan Museum of Art (1997.7) is described in *When Silk Was Gold*.\textsuperscript{269} The Metropolitan Museum of Art piece features a weft thread count that varies widely (between 40-140 threads per cm) as well as irregular weaving, two features commonly found in the *kesi* of Eastern Central Asia. In addition to the similarity of the pattern on this boot cover to other well-analyzed pieces, a connection to Khitan weaving traditions is likely as the use of *kesi* was similar; the Khitan used *kesi* for boot covers and boots themselves (as well as for other pieces of clothing), while the Northern Song was much more likely to use *kesi* as sutra covers.\textsuperscript{270}

The use of purple dye as a background color is typical of *kesi* produced in the Mongol period, and indeed purple appears to have been more widespread as a clothing color for court dress at this time, although many of the dyes used in textiles remained the

\textsuperscript{267} Zhao Feng and Xia Hexiu, “Damaoqi Dasujixiang Mingshui mudi chutu de sizhipin,” 119.
\textsuperscript{268} Zhao Feng, *Treasures in Silk*, 165.
\textsuperscript{269} *WSW*, 74.
\textsuperscript{270} *WSWG*, 60.
same as those used in earlier centuries. While there were few examples of what we consider purple today used as a textile dye on a large scale from the Tang, Song, Liao, and Jin dynasties (we recall that these were more reddish or brown-red in hue), in the Mongol era we can assume when a robe was referred to as *zi* (紫)-colored, it was indeed a shade that we would today consider purple, mauve, or violet and not some shade of red.

Textiles woven with a purple ground in the AEDTA collection today in the Musée Guimet have been chemically analyzed and the dyes used were, as in earlier periods, plant based. For example, we turn to, two purple fragments of material likely used for a robe from the Mongol period. The warp and weft threads of AEDTA 3746 (fig. 2.18), a dark purple tabby weave silk with a pattern of coiled dragons woven by a supplementary decorative weft in gold, were dyed using something similar to madder (*Rubia tinctorum*) along with dye from the plant known in Japanese as *shinkon* (紫根) or *murasaki* (紫) (*Lithospermum purpurocaerula*). A second piece, AEDTA 3269 (fig. 2.19), another purple tabby weave silk with a supplementary decorative weft in gold of hares in an arch-

---

271 According to Zhao Feng, dyes used during the Mongol period included the plant-based safflower, sapanwood, indigo, yellow fustic tree, *Sophora japonica*, and oak, though imported dyes such as madder from the northwest (of China) and buckthorn flowers (for a green) from the northeast (of China) were also used. See Zhao Feng, “Silk Artistry of the Yuan dynasty,” 333. The use of these dyes are confirmed by the chemical analyses performed on pieces from the AEDTA collection in the mid-1990s by Mr. Jan Wouters at the IRPA in Brussels. The dyes used on these silk pieces include madder, safflower, *Lithospermum pupurocaerula*, *Sophora japonica*, indigo, and yellow larkspur (or equivalent). All technical information from the “Archives of Marie-Hélène Guelton and the AEDTA,” unpublished. Guelton, along with Gabriel Vial, performed technical analysis on most of the pieces from the Liao, Jin, and Yuan dynasties in the collection.

272 Purple dye of this sort was used on smaller pieces from at least the Tang dynasty. An example of purple damask gauze from the Tang dynasty is found on a square fragment (possibly a pillow end) in the collection of Chris Hall in Hong Kong.

273 Chemical analysis by Mr. Jan Wouters at the IRPA in Brussels. “Archives of Marie-Hélène Guelton and the AEDTA,” unpublished.
shaped repeat, also has warp and weft threads dyed with something like *Lithospermum purpurocaerula.*\(^{274}\) Analogous pieces to AEDTA 3269 are in the collection of the Cleveland Museum of Art (1991.113)\(^{275}\) and the Metropolitan Museum of Art (1998.438).

**Dragons**

Another example of *kesi* with a purple background from the pre-1260 period is in the Chris Hall Collection in Hong Kong (fig. 2.20).\(^{276}\) This piece is one of a number of similar *kesi* fragments showing dragons chasing flaming pearls – there are comparable pieces in both the Metropolitan Museum of Art (1987.8) and the Cleveland Museum of Art (1988.33).\(^{277}\) The piece from the Chris Hall collection also shows a half cloud collar (*yun jian* 雲肩, “cloud shoulder”), similar to another piece in a private collection published in *When Silk Was Gold.*\(^{278}\) Both this piece and the other one with the partial cloud collar have a selvage going down the center of the cloud collar, thus requiring two loom widths to complete the pattern.\(^{279}\) It is likely the fragments were used as material for robes. The cloud collar design was very popular as a motif decorating the collar and shoulders of robes in the Mongol period, and was also used as a motif in other media.

---

\(^{274}\) Chemical analysis by Mr. Jan Wouters at the IRPA in Brussels. “Archives of Marie-Hélène Guelton and the AEDTA, unpublished.

\(^{275}\) Published in *WSWG* cat. 34, 124-125.

\(^{276}\) This piece was formerly in the collection of Dennis R. Dodds (Philadelphia), and is published in *WSWG* fig. 26, 75.

\(^{277}\) All published in *WSWG*, cat. 17, 18, 75-79.

\(^{278}\) *WSWG*, 75.

\(^{279}\) *WSWG*, 75, 77.
such as ceramics and metalwork. The first textual and material evidence we have for the cloud collar pattern being used on robes dates to the Jin dynasty; the term yun jian is used in describing imperial dress in Jin shi juan 43, and the cloud collar design is depicted in the Jin-era painting, Lady Wenji Returns to Han (fig. 1.38). The cloud collar persisted in both male and female dress during the Mongol period, seen in a surviving example of a cloud collar on a female robe which is brocaded in gold on a silk twill robe (fig. 2.21).

The dragons on all four examples of kesi are similarly executed, with winding bodies, stag-like horns, and five claws executed in a pinwheel shape. As we saw in the previous chapter, coiled dragons were used to decorate robes of royalty in the Liao, Jin, and Tangut courts. In Chinese court dress the coiled dragon was restricted to use on the robes of high officials and the imperial family during the reign of Empress Wu Zetian (690-705 CE). In the Yuan dynasty, the Tongzhi tiaoge records that the use of the dragon as a textile motif was restricted during the first year of Temür Khan’s (Emperor

280 Schuyler Cammann argues that the origins of the “cloud collar” motif derive from the cosmological ornamentation on the backs of Han dynasty mirrors, and then in the Medieval period from the form of the eight-petal lotus and Buddhist Mandala. He also notes that the first use of cloud collars on robes is attested in the Jin dynasty. See Schuyler Cammann, “The Symbolism of the Cloud Collar Motif,” The Art Bulletin, vol. 33, No. 1 (March, 1951), 1-9.

281 See also Yuka Kadoi, Islamic Chinoiserie: The Art of Mongol Iran (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009), 32.

282 The Tang huiyao (Institutional History of the Tang or Records of Tang Institutions) notes that in the third year of the Tianshou era (694 CE, during Empress Wu Zetian’s reign) new embroidered robes were given to the high officials, and later that year the coiled dragon (盤龍 panlong) and phoenix motifs were restricted for use of officials of the third grade or higher and the imperial family. See Wang Pu (王溥), Tang huiyao (唐會要) part 1, (Taipei: Taiwan shangwu yinshuguan, 1968), juan 32, 582. The authors of WSWG also mention this passage, 110 (footnote 15). Schuyler Cammann suggests that robes with dragon designs were first truly restricted to imperial use in a decree of 1111 CE during the Song dynasty. See Schuyler Cammann, China’s Dragon Robes (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1952), 5.
Chengzong) reign (1294). The depiction of five-clawed dragons, however, was not restricted to specifically imperial use until the 1314 sumptuary regulations that were enacted in Emperor Renzong’s reign, meaning that this restriction would not necessarily apply in the pre-1260 period. Returning to the kesi fragments, the background on all of the pieces is purple with a design of tiny clouds in a variety of colors. The dragons, their scales, and the clouds are outlined in gold thread.

In form, the dragons on these four pieces are related to the embroidered dragons circling a flaming pearl in the collection of the Musée Guimet discussed in the Liao dress section in Chapter 1 (fig. 1.21). The embroidered dragons only have three claws, but their bodies are sinewy and twisted in a comparable fashion to the kesi dragons, and there is similarity in the execution of the heads, which feature a long tongue sticking out through rows of pointed teeth. The resemblance of these dragons to the embroidered one classified as Liao by the AEDTA (although the piece AEDTA 3912 might actually be Jin) and the presence of cloud collars shows a connection to Liao and Jin dynasty design precedents. However, the combination of these two designs, along with a dense background pattern, distinguishes this sort of pattern from preceding ones. Indeed,

---

283 *Tongzhi tiaoge, juan* 9, 134.
Zhao Feng mentions this is the earliest reference to Mongol imperial restrictions on the dragon pattern in Zhao Feng, “Meng Yuan xiongbei jiqi yuanliu” 蒙元胸背及其源流 [A Study on Xiongbei Badge during the Mongol Yuan Dynasty], in Zhao Feng and Shang Gang (ed.). Silk Road and Mongol Yuan Art (丝绸之路与元代艺术) – Papers from the International Symposium (11.1-11.2.2005, Hangzhou). (Hong Kong: ISAT/Costume Squad Ltd., 2005), 143.

284 “蒙古人不在禁限，及見當怯薛諸色人等，亦不在禁限，惟不許服龍鳳文。”YS juan 78, 1942.
The same passage is also found in *Tongzhi tiaoge*, Yuandai shiliao congkan (series of Yuan materials and history), (Zhejiang: Zhejiang guji chuban she, 1986), juan 9, 134.
textiles in the Mongol period, especially *nasīj*, are characterized by combinations of motifs as well as a density of overall design.

**Lions**

Another *kesi* piece decorated with a comparably dense design to the *kesi* piece with the dragons, featuring rows of lions and palmettes among scrolling vines, is another example of an early Mongol pattern based on preexisting motifs brought together to create a hybrid design. A large fragment of this piece is in the Cleveland Museum of Art (1991.3) (fig. 2.22) and a smaller fragment, likely from the same piece, is in the Musée Guimet (AEDTA 3277) (fig. 2.23). A similar fragment, published in *When Silk Was Gold* and showing a partial cloud-collar is in a private collection.285 The bodies of the lions and the scrolling vines are delineated in pink thread and the lions and part of the palmettes are filled in with gold thread. The background color of the *kesi* appears black, confirmed by the analysis of the AEDTA piece,286 although the technical analysis of the CMA piece identifies the color as dark brown.287 The lions and palmettes derive in form from Central Asian and Western prototypes, and according to the authors of *When Silk Was Gold*, within some of the palmettes is a stylized pattern based on the Kufic script (called “Kufesque” in the catalogue).288 We see the antecedents of the palmette design used in a variety of geographical locations and across media, including Sassanian (c. sixth century

---

285 *WSWG*, fig. 28.
287 *WSWG* 80.
288 *WSWG*, 80.
CE) architectural decoration and Qu’ran manuscript decoration (c. tenth century CE) (figs. 2.24, 2.25). The form was one of the most popular motifs on textiles, especially in the western Mongol empire in the thirteenth-fourteenth centuries. We find examples of palmettes from this period include motifs on AEDTA 3747 (fig. 2.11), AEDTA 3380 (fig. 2.12), and CMA 1994.293 (fig. 2.13), which were studied in the context of jin duanzi.

Lions appear on decorative arts across Asia in the centuries before the Mongol conquests. Comparing eastern and western examples, we see that our present lion (fig. 2.22, 2.23) belongs to a western tradition. A comparison of a c. sixth century CE woven fragment with designs of lions, elephants, and stupas, and characters from northern China (fig. 2.26) and a luster-glazed bowl from the Fatimid period in Egypt (fig. 2.27), reveals the Fatimid lion to be more similar to our woven Mongol period example than the Chinese woven example.289 Both lions are shown in profile with the front right paw raised as they stalk forward, and both have decorative curls forming their manes. Their tails angle downward, with the woven tails terminating in a loop, while the Fatimid lion’s tail curls around a back leg. In contrast, the Chinese example shows a front-facing lion with a tail flipping upward and a mane defined by linear elements. The felines on nasīj textiles such as CMA 1990.2 (fig. 2.1), CMA 1989.50 (fig. 2.28), and on the inner flap of the skirt of the robe found at Mingshui (fig. 2.29) all correspond to variants of the western-style lion produced in Central Asia.

289 Anne Wardwell provides an excellent description of the characteristics, especially the tails, of woven Central Asian lions during the Mongol period. See Wardwell, “Two Silk and Gold Textiles of the Early Mongol Period,” 361.
Inscribed Textiles

Inscribed textiles became increasingly popular in the Mongol period, especially those woven with Kufic or pseudo-Kufic Arabic script. Kufic script is characterized by regular, monumental, angular letters.\(^{290}\) A clear example of Arabic Kufic script is the text from a page of the 10\(^{th}\) century Qu’ran decorated with the palmette mentioned above (fig. 2.25). Several pre-1260 Mongol period examples of textiles woven with designs based on Kufic, pseudo-Kufic, and other non-Chinese scripts have been preserved in monasteries in Tibet and excavated. We should distinguish Mongol-era pseudo-inscriptions from those found on Jin textiles, such as those woven in gold on the Chris Hall Collection hunting robe and found in the Jin tomb of the King of Qi state near Acheng (figs. 1.41, 1.42). While the Jin and Mongol pieces are both woven in imitation of Kufic, pseudo-Kufic (or Kufesque), (or, in the case of the Acheng tomb, Devanagari), inscriptions appearing on textiles in Central and West Asia, the Jin examples appear to imitate actual inscriptions. The Mongol pseudo-inscriptions seem more purely decorative, a pattern of Arabic letters rather than words or phrases. This is notable because textiles with actual Arabic inscriptions were produced during the Mongol period, though not on robes, meaning that the stylization of the script was possibly intentional rather than a misreading of a foreign script by a weaver.

\(^{290}\) Sheila Blair defines Kūfī/Kufic as “literally, from Kufa, a garrison city in southern Iraq founded in 638 CE and one of the intellectual centers in early Islamic times; a general term used to refer to the angular scripts used for early copies of the Koran.” See Sheila Blair, Islamic Calligraphy (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006), xxi.
An example of such stylization is found in a woven inscription, possibly from a robe, unearthed at Mingshui, Damaoqi (fig. 2.30). It is woven in weft-faced compound tabby with wefts in yellow, purple, and green forming the script pattern as well as horizontal bands of floral decoration above and below it. On this piece, we see pseudo-Kufic script in an interlaced pattern radiating out from a central roundel. Though it is clearly a design based on the Arabic script, it is not a design in imitation of an actual inscription. Rather, it seems that the letters were used as decorative devices. We can make out what looks like a alef (א) or lam (ل) with the tops of each alef or lam connecting and crossing through the central circle and the tails of the letters elaborated into leaves. This pattern was widespread in the Mongol period as we also find variations of it on several pieces from the mid-13th century. A small version decorates the frame of a roundel woven with a continuous overall pattern in gold in the collection of the China National Silk Museum (no. 3214) (fig. 2.31), resembling a pattern of interlaced alefs. Another is in the frame of the roundel of a panel woven in lampas with gold and silk from the first half of the 14th century in the David Collection (40/1997) (fig. 2.32). A larger example, closer to the Mingshui design in size runs along the top of 14/1992, is in the David Collection (fig. 2.33). Giving more evidence that the Mingshui example came from a robe are the designs from the shoulders of lampas-woven nasīj braided-waist

---

291 Zhao Feng proposes that, based on the placement of inscriptions on the Jin robe woven with a non-Chinese script in supplemental gold weft unearthed in Acheng, Heilongjiang and another Mongol-era robe with a similar pattern of interlaced Arabic letters also unearthed in Mingshui, this may be a fragment from the shoulder of a robe. See Zhao Feng, Treasures in Silk, 188, figs. 06.02 a and b.

292 Zhao Feng notes that weft-faced compound tabby is a rare weave, see Zhao Feng, Treasures in Silk, 188.
(bianxian 編織) robes in the David Collection (23/2004) (fig. 2.34), Rossi and Rossi in London (fig. 2.35), and the Chris Hall Collection (fig. 2.36).

These examples appear to have a relationship to Kufic script, although the alphabetic elements have been abstracted and turned into design elements. There may be a relationship between this type of abstraction and the decorative knotting of Kufic script in inscriptions dating from the first half of the 14th century in the Islamic world. We see clear examples of such interweaving in the architectural inscriptions on the walls of the Hall of Comares, built by the Nasrid emir Yusuf I (r. 1333-1354), in the Alhambra Palace in Granada, Spain (fig. 2.37). The inscription\(^\text{293}\) runs along the base of a panel, the letters of the text continuing upward to form decorative knots and interlacing, continuing to form a pseudo-script pattern that mirrors the legible inscription. Polychrome variants of interlaced letters used as architectural motifs remain from the Mongol period in Iran, such as a blue-glazed alif-lam knot (fig. 2.38) in the collection of the Louvre in Paris, or a frieze with a Quranic inscription with the tops of the letters forming a decorative knot from the collection of the Musée des Arts Décoratifs in Paris (fig. 2.39). The designers of the Mongol textile inscriptions may have adapted the decorative, non-legible elements of such designs in place of true inscriptions on robes and woven panels.

The placement and type of script relate the pattern on the Mingshui, David Collection, Rossi and Rossi, and Chris Hall Collection robes to ṭirāz bands on textiles

\(^{293}\) This reads: *Allahumma, la-ka al-Hamd da’iman wa-la-ka al-shukr qa’iman*, “Oh God, everlasting praise be thine, unending thanks be thine” See José Miguel Puerta Vilchez, *Reading the Alhambra: A visual guide to the Alhambra through its inscriptions*, trans. Jon Trout (Granada: The Alhambra and Generalife Trust and EDILUX s.l., 2011), 127-128.
produced under the ‘Abbasid (c. 758-1258) and Fatimid (c. 909-1171) caliphs from the 9th-13th centuries in Islamic lands in west Asia. Ṭīrāz bands often contained the name of the caliph, local ruler, or auspicious words or phrases. At both the ‘Abbasid and Fatimid courts ṭīrāz bands and Arabic inscriptions on textiles certainly imparted a certain status on the wearer, specifically wealth and power. However, whether the use of Arabic script as a decorative element had a similar significance to the early Mongols is uncertain.

Inscriptions did not only exist as decorative elements on robes; as we have seen, the nasīj panels in the Cleveland Museum of Art (1990.2) and David Collection (14/1992 and 40/1997), which were probably not destined to be used as material for robes, feature bands of pseudo-Kufic script across the top of the design. The inscriptions on CMA 1990.2 and David Collection 14/1992 are the area of the textile mentioned above that uses both flat and wrapped gold threads to give a depth to the pattern not found in other sections of the piece.

Such pseudo-inscriptions should be compared to textiles from this period featuring readable inscriptions. Klejd von Folsach has identified three of these: one in the David Collection in Copenhagen inscribed for the ruler of Fars Abu Bakr (r. 1226-1260) (fig. 2.40); a ṭīrāz found in the tomb of Rudolph IV (d. 1365) in Vienna inscribed with

---


Abu Sa’id’s name, dated to between 1319 and 1335 (fig. 2.41); and a silk and gold ṭīrāz woven with the name of Nasir al-Din Muhammad ibn Qala’un (r. 1293-94/693;1299-1308/698-708; and 1310-1341/709-741CE) now in Lübeck (fig. 2.42). The inscription on the Abu Bakr textile runs across the top, in the same fashion as CMA 1990.2 and David Collection 14/1992. The Abu Sa’id ṭīrāz on the other hand has placed the inscribed bands so that they will fall vertically down the robe, in quite different placement to both the Mingshui robe with inscriptions and the Acheng Jin robe, where the inscription runs down the shoulders towards the sleeves and the hem of the robe. Finally, the inscription on the Nasir al-Din Muhammad ṭīrāz is found inside a small circular section on the wing of the confronted birds in roundels. This may have some rapport with the small interlaced alef pattern used on roundels in both China National Silk Museum 3214 and David Collection 40/1997. It is important to consider this early use by the Mongols of actual and pseudo-inscriptions. Ṭīrāz bands, their production, and use on robes, will be further discussed in the Ilkhanid context in Chapter 4.

---


298 For a translation of the Abu Bakr ṭīrāz see WSWG, 135. Kjeld von Folsach has determined that these three textiles are the only surviving ones from the Ilkhanid period with legible inscriptions. See von Folsach, “A Set of Silk Panels from the Mongol Period,” 233-237.
Male Dress

Robes

So far, we have looked at material that likely was used for robes, including kesi, nasīj, and tabby or twill weave silk with a supplementary gold pattern weft (jin duanzi), in addition to woven patterns, without looking at any complete robes. The only complete examples of male dress from the pre-1260 Mongol period that has survived archaeologically appears to be the braided waist, or bianxian robe. This robe gives us the archetypal male Mongol silhouette featuring a cinched waist created by a wide, braided or ribboned band, a side closure with ties, long, narrow sleeves, and a calf-length skirt. Examples likely from the period in question have been unearthed at Mingshui (fig. 2.43), and exist in collections such as the Chris Hall Collection in Hong Kong (fig. 2.44), the David Collection in Copenhagen (23/2004) (fig. 2.45), two variations in Rossi and Rossi London (figs. 2.46, 2.47), and the China National Silk Museum (fig. 2.48). The bianxian robe is also pictorially depicted in a large-scale painting from the Yuan dynasty, Hunting Geese (sheyan tu 射雁圖) in the National Palace Museum in Taipei (fig. 2.49), and in the woodblock-printed Yuan dynasty version of the encyclopedia Shilin guangji (事林廣記 “A Guide through the Forest of Affairs), as an example of the dress of a Mongol archer (fig. 2.50).

The robes in the collections mentioned above are made using a variety of weaving techniques. The robes in the Chris Hall Collection, the David Collection, one of the Rossi and Rossi robes (fig. 2.46), and the Mingshui robe may be categorized as nasīj, while the second Rossi and Rossi robe (fig. 2.47) is made of twill damask, and the CNSM robe is
described as gilded tabby (that is, tabby-weave cloth with supplementary decorative pattern wefts of a lamella of gilded, probably animal, substrate, like jin duanzi). Three of the nasīj robes, from the Chris Hall Collection, the David Collection and Rossi and Rossi, have pseudo-inscriptions on their shoulders, discussed above (figs. 2.33, 2.34, 2.35, 2.36). The robes also feature skirts attached to the upper part of the garment with a series of tiny pleats just under the braided waist. Their patterns are similar as well, with a tiny background design – cloud-like elements, swastikas, or other geometric repeats – and larger repeats of palmette-shaped elements with either vegetal or zoomorphic motifs in the center. These and the Mingshui robe close on the right with ribbon ties, while the closing for the CNSM robe is unclear, if it had ribbons once, they are gone now. The ribbon-waisted robe from Rossi and Rossi closes to the left, although the waist appears to close in the front with frogs. In the painting Hunting Geese at the National Palace Museum, the bianxian robe on a rider with his back to us appears to close in the back with frogs. It is very possible that this painting, though appearing to be depicting bianxian robes, is in fact portraying a wide fabric belt that closely resembles bianxian robes.

Peng Daya and Xu Ting describe something worn by 13th-century Mongols that may have a relationship to the bianxian robe: “Around their midriff they all secretly wear a very fine inner garment at the waist with countless pleats; if the Chinese ceremonial robe [shen yi 深衣] is sewn with only twelve lengths of cloth, the Tatar's inner shirt has more! They also use red and purple silk intertwined into a horizontal sash across their midriff, which they call a 'stomach sash'. They really want that on horseback; with their
waist band tied tight it appears magnificent.” This description does not correspond exactly to any of the examples that we looked at above, other than perhaps the attire depicted in *Hunting Geese*. If the robes Peng Daya and Xu Ting saw were woven with gold they assumedly would have mentioned this. The intertwined silk making up the stomach sash may have some relationship to the braided waist, perhaps in the style of those robes depicted in the painting, though we have no surviving examples in either red or purple silk. As we will see in the next chapter, the *bianxian* robe continued to be worn in the Yuan dynasty, and became popular in 14th century Korea.

**Belts, Gifting, and Ceremonial Dress**

The ceremonial uses of clothing have their roots in the early period of Mongol rule. The gifting of clothing and belts, which would become part of more elaborate ceremonial occasions such as the *jisün* banquets of the Yuan era, were important markers of the Khan’s power and relationship to his officials. William of Rubruck notes that Möngke made biannual gifts to Mongol nobles in the spring and at the end of summer, requiring all of them to assemble in Karakorum: “[Möngke] bestows upon them garments and presents and displays his great glory.” In the *Secret History*, when the leader of the Uighurs first swears his allegiance to Chinggis Khan, he mentions both his “crimson

---

See *Heidai shiliüe* in *Siku quanshu* v. 423 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1995), 534 B; and *Heida shiliüe* (trans. and ed. Erich Haenisch and Yao Ts’ung-wu), Peng Daya and Su Ting, 121.
300 Rubruck in Dawson, *Mission to Asia*, 175. See also Rockhill, 207.
coat” and his “golden belt”\textsuperscript{301} The golden belt referred to by the ruler of the Uighurs indicates one of the most significant pieces of clothing worn by the Mongols. We find descriptions of these belts or girdles by visitors to the Mongol court. For example, John of Plano Carpini describes them as part of ambassadorial tribute: “So many gifts were bestowed by the envoys that it was marvelous to behold – gifts of silk, samite, velvet, brocade, girdles of silk threaded with gold, choice furs and other presents.”\textsuperscript{302}

Adding to its ceremonial significance, the golden girdle was a metaphor for the Khan’s power, as we read in the \textit{Secret History}:

After that, as Cinggis Qa’an’s one hundred envoys with Uquna at their head had been help up and slain by the Sarta’ul people, Cinggis Qa’an said, “How can my ‘golden halter’ be broken by the Sarta’ul people?” And he said, “I shall set out against the Sarta’ul people.”\textsuperscript{303}

De Rachewiltz explains that “the ‘golden halter’ refers to the firm bond uniting the Mongol khan to other rulers who owed him allegiance.”\textsuperscript{304} We find references to golden belts or girdles in historical texts about non-Chinese groups, as well as actual golden belts from archaeological sites. A thin gold-woven belt was found in the Jin dynasty tomb of the King of the state of Qi in Acheng, Heilongjiang, which is described as made of gold

\textsuperscript{301} The \textit{idu’ut} of the Ui’ut [i.e. ruler of the Uighurs] sent envoys to Cinggis Qa’an. Through the envoys Atkiraq and Darbai, he had the following petition conveyed to him:

‘As if one saw Mother Sun/ When the clouds disperse;/ As if one came upon the river water/ When the ice disappears,/ So I greatly rejoiced when I heard of the fame of Cinggis Qa’an. If through your favour, O Cinggis Qa’an, I were to obtain/ But a ring from your golden belt,/ But a thread from your crimson coat,/ I will become your fifth son and will serve you.” Rachewiltz, \textit{Secret History}, Section 238, 163.

\textsuperscript{302} Carpinin Dawson, \textit{Mission to Asia}, 64. See also Komroff, 44-45.

\textsuperscript{303} Rachewiltz, \textit{Secret History}, Section 254, 181.

\textsuperscript{304} Rachewiltz, \textit{Secret History}, Section 254, 181, note 4.
“brocade” (fig. 2.51). It appears to be woven with an all-over geometric motif in gold, perhaps a variant or precursor of the “silk girdles wrought with gold” described by Carpini.

Belts played an important symbolic role in investiture ceremonies prior to the Mongol period in the Steppe region, West Asia (the Persian cultural sphere), and in China from at least the Sui-Tang period. We recall from Chapter 1 that belts were essential parts of Liao, Jin, and Uighur dress. As the belt had such symbolism associated with it for the Mongols and their precursors, it is no surprise that it played a significant role in Mongol investiture ceremonies. Juvayni records Ögödei’s investiture ceremony (in 1229), noting that those surrounding Ögödei, “In accordance with their ancient custom…removed their hats and slung their belts across their backs.” At Güyük’s investiture ceremony (1246) likewise, “the princes gathered together and took of their hats and loosened their belts.” Allsen attributes a West Asian origin for the belt’s importance to the Mongols, although this would be an ancient rather than medieval origin; it seems that belts had a crucial role in Chinese diplomatic dealings with Turko-Mongol groups from a very early period. Allsen also notes that golden belts were important markers of “personal dependency of the servitors” of a ruler. As with gifts in

305 Zhu Qixin, “Royal Costumes of the Jin Dynasty,” Orientations, vol. 21 (December, 1990), 62, fig. 6.
306 Allsen, Commodity and Exchange, 84. In Sui and early Tang China investiture rituals involving belts and robes, and particularly riding coats, were practiced when investing “outer clients,” that is foreigners, a practice criticized by the Confucians. These practices allegedly started between the Han and the Xiongnu as early as 174 BCE. See Jonathan Karam Skaff, Sui-Tang China and its Turko-Mongol Neighbors: Culture, Power, and Connections 580-800 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 162-166.
309 Allsen, Commodity and Exchange, 84; Skaff, 162-166.
310 Allsen, Commodity and Exchange, 85.
other societies, where gifting implied a reciprocal action of some sort, the golden girdle marked the ruler’s might and generosity in exchange for servitude of his officials.

Arguably, the most important male garment of the Yuan dynasty was the *jisün* (Mongolian) or, in Chinese, *zhisun* (質孫), also called *zhama* (詐馬) suit, monochrome outfits described in detail in the *Yuan shi* and were worn by officials and by the emperor. *Jisün* robes and banquets will be discussed more fully in the next chapter, but should be introduced here as they likely originated in the early period of Mongol rule. First introduced under Chinggis, Juvayni describes these type of suits worn at Ögödei’s election and investiture: “And in like manner for full forty days they donned each day new clothes of different color and quaffed cups of wine, and at the same time discussing the affairs of the kingdom.” Carpini corroborates that the same rotation of monochrome clothing was practiced at the election and investiture of Güyük, described by Carpini: “One the first day they were all clothed in white velvet, on the second in red…on the third day they were all in blue velvet and on the fourth in the finest brocade.” It is likely that *jisün* robes were not cut or tailored in a specific way different from other forms of Mongol official dress, but in fact derived their name and significance from the fact that they were worn at *jisün* banquets. This will be further discussed in Chapter 3.

---

312 *YS, juan* 78, 1929-1930, 1938. See also *WSWG*, 138.
313 See Chapter 1, 19.
Female Dress

Female dress in the Mongol Empire appears to have been less diverse than male dress. Additionally, there is no specific material evidence to show that female dress changed in any substantial way from the early (pre-1260) to late (1260-1368) periods of the Mongol Empire. There is a marked lack of material evidence for female dress from the early period. However, contemporary travel accounts correspond to a certain extent to later pictorial and material evidence so we may hypothesize that female dress was relatively unchanged throughout the thirteenth century.

There were at least two genres of dress commonly worn in the eastern end of the Mongol Empire, iterations of the exceedingly ample, side-closing, long-sleeved robe worn in pictorial depictions of Mongol noblewomen (fig. 2.52, 2.53), and Chinese-style layered skirt, top, and short jacket (fig. 2.54). This latter style will be discussed in the chapter on Yuan dress, as it does not appear that Mongol female subjects wore these garments prior to 1260. Indeed, a full categorization of Mongol female dress will be presented in the following chapter, based on both excavated material and records of clothing regulations from the Yuan dynasty. If we take Ilkhanid manuscript painting to be a reflection of actual court dress, the ample, side-closing robe not only continued to be worn through the Yuan dynasty, but was possibly worn by noblewomen at the Ilkhanid court (fig. 2.55). Clearly, this style of robe was typical of Mongol noblewomen, though it is rarely discussed in recent studies of Mongol dress. It was worn with the boqta (or boghta), called gugu guan (罟罟冠／固姑冠／顧姑冠) in Chinese. With its cylindrical shaft that flares out at the very top to form a sort of beak, the boqta is one of the
trademarks of thirteenth and fourteenth century Mongol female dress and is described in most of the 13th century travel accounts used as source material for this chapter.

Robes

We will approach the boqta and robe separately here. Regarding female clothing, William of Rubruck notes,

The costume of the [women] is no different from that of the men except that it is somewhat longer. But on the day after she is married a woman shaves from the middle of her head to her forehead, and she has a tunic as wide as a nun’s cowl, and in every respect wider and longer, and open in front, and this they tie on the right side. Now in this matter the Tartars differ from the Turks, for the Turks tie their tunics on the left, but the Tartars always on the right.316

John of Plano Carpini similarly finds the women’s robes to be quite like male dress, though we know from the material record that this is hardly an accurate assessment: “The clothes of both the men and the women are made in the same style. They do not use capes, cloaks or hoods, but wear tunics of buckram, velvet, or brocade made in the following fashion: they are open from top to bottom and are folded over the breast; they are fastened on the left with one tie, on the right with three, on the left side also they are open as far as the waist.”317 Chinese descriptions of women’s robes also mainly focus on

316 Rubruck in Dawson, 102. See also Manuel Komroff (ed.), Contemporaries of Marco Polo, 69.
317 Carpini in Dawson, 7.
the fact that the robe is ample and side closing.\textsuperscript{318} As Zhao Hong observes, “Their clothing is similar to the garments of the Chinese Taoists… Furthermore, they have a jacket with wide sleeves, which resembles the Chinese “crane cloak”; it is wide and long and drags on the ground. When they walk, two female servants carry [the train of the robe].”\textsuperscript{319}

Despite the lack of specificity in these accounts, the texts correspond to pictorial and archaeological evidence for Mongol female dress (fig. 2.56). While our pictorial examples come from the Yuan and Ilkhanid periods, the cut of the robe does not seem to have been altered in any significant way. That is, it is side closing, wide sleeved, tapering at the wrists, and made of an abundance of fabric which would likely trail on the ground. Our evidence limits our understanding of the potential diversity of the dress of Mongol noblewomen, however. For example, considering that Mongol women were described as able horsewomen in several travel accounts Mongol women surely had several different styles of dress to choose from. We know that one method of mounting on horseback with their ample robes was by fastening them with a system of sashes or belts, as William of Rubruck notes, “All the women sit on their horses like men, astride, and they tie their cowls with a piece of sky-blue silk round the waist, and with another strip they bind their breasts, and they fasten a piece of white stuff below their eyes which hangs down to the breast.”\textsuperscript{320}

\textsuperscript{318} As noted in the preceding chapter, closing the robe on the right or left side does not seem to have been as straightforward an ethnic marker as some of these sources lead us to believe.

\textsuperscript{319} “衣如中國鶴氅寬長曳地，行則兩女奴拽之。” Zhao Hong, Meng da bei lü, shuo xuan 12. See also German translation in Erich Haenisch and Yao Ts’ung-wu, 79.

\textsuperscript{320} Rubruck in Dawson, 102. See also Komroff, Contemporaries of Marco Polo, 69-70.
Pictorial evidence in the forms of official portraits of high-ranking officials’ wives or the consort of the Khan put forth a specific, idealized type of dress. In these official portraits women are inevitably dressed in red, ample robes that cover their feet, with tall, red *boqtas* on their heads. We will see in the next chapter, however, that Yuan female dress indeed had some diversity; it is hardly a leap in logic to assume that pre-Yuan female dress was similarly diverse.

Further textual evidence from the *Secret History of the Mongols* is given in an episode after the death of Chinggis (who was still at that time called Temüjin) father when his mother, Lady Hö’elün, prepares herself to take care of her sons: “Pulling firmly her tall hat/Over her head,/Tying tightly her belt to shorten her skirt…” Although Mongol women are not portrayed wearing belts or girdles, this evidence from the *SH* shows that they indeed must have worn belts when riding horses, though likely their riding gowns were a good deal more practical than the overlong court dresses we find in the pictorial evidence. Paul Pelliot explains that the verb used for “pulling her tall hat firmly” is “*boqtala-*” or “*boqtola-*” which means to put on the *boqta*. This headdress therefore, appears not only to have been worn in court settings but a symbol of preparing oneself for an important task.

Regarding pre-Mongol precedents for the large female robe, the most similar female attire from the area is the front-closing wide robe with lapels known to us from donor portraits (fig. 2.57). In the Uighur context, the robe is tan or red, and we see in
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322 Paul Pelliot, “Les mots à h initiale, aujourd’hui amuie, dans le Mongol des XIIIe et XIVe siècles,” *Journal asiatique*, vol. 206 (April-June, 1925), 221-222.
donor portraits that it trails on the ground, covering the feet. There are clear differences
between this and the Mongol variant, namely the collar and closing. In addition, the
Mongol version appears to be made with more material. Nonetheless, there are definite
similarities between how these robes were represented. Even more interesting in terms of
parallels between Uighur and Mongol female dress is the inclusion by von Gabain, of an
example of Uighur female dress (her category 7) that includes a depiction of a young
woman wearing a *boqta* (fig. 2.58). If we accept this as a portrayal of a Uighur woman,
this is an essential piece of evidence for overlapping fashion amongst the Uighurs and
Mongols.

The *Boqta*

Compared to their terse descriptions of dress, our travelers are positively effusive
in their observations about the *boqta*. Descriptions exist from Peng Daya and Xu Ting,
Zhao Hong, William of Rubruck, and Li Zhichang. These descriptions are all very
similar, though the most detailed description is from William of Rubruck. He notes:
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324 Zhao Hong: “妻則有故姑冠用鐵絲結成形如竹夫人。長三尺許用紅青錦繡或珠金飾之。”
“The wives of the tribal chiefs all wear the *gugu* headdress. The frame [of the *gugu*] is made of braided iron wire, into the shape of a ‘bamboo lady’.
It is about three *chi* long. It is covered with a splendid red and blue-green brocade and sometimes ornamented with pearls and gold.” (My translation). Zhao Hong, *Meng da bei lü, shuo xuan* 12. See also German translation in Erich Haenisch and Yao Ts’ung-wu, 79.
Peng Daya and Xu Ting: “霆見其故故之制。用畫木為骨包以紅銀金帛頂之。上用四五尺長挒杖或鐵
打成杖。包以青氈其向上人則用。我朝翠花或五彩帛飾之，今其飛動以下人則用野鷄毛。”
“Ting saw the arrangement of their *gugu*: they use painted wood for the frame, wrap it with red silk fabric and gold and silk brocade, and on top of the summit, they use willow branches four or five chi long, or else iron beaten into branches, and wrap it with green felt. With those relatively higher in rank, they use our dynasty's banners embroidered with kingfishers or five-colored silk to decorate it, thus making them flutter in the wind, while those of low rank, they use the down of wild fowl.” Translation from Johan Elverskog, “Things and the Qing: Mongol Culture in the Visual Narrative,” (2004), 162.
They have also an ornament for their heads which they call \textit{botta}, being made of the bark of a tree, or of some such other light material. It is so thick and round that it cannot be held but in both hands together, and it has a square sharp spire rising from the top more than a cubit high and fashioned like a column. This \textit{botta} they cover all over with a piece of rich silk: it is hollow within, and upon the spire, or square top, they put a bunch of quills or of slender canes a cubit long and more. This tuft they beautify with peacocks’ feathers, and round about its length with feathers of a mallard’s tail, and with precious stones. Great ladies wear this kind of ornament upon their heads, binding it strongly with a certain hat, which has a hole in the crown fit for the spire to come through it. Under this ornament they gather up their hair in a knot, and they bind it strongly under their throats. When a great company of such gentlewomen riding together are beheld far off, they seem to be soldiers with helmets on their heads carrying their lances upright.\footnote{Komroff, \textit{Contemporaries of Marco Polo}, 69-70. See also Rubruck in Dawson, 102.}

Li Zhichang writes that the \textit{boqta} was additionally a marker of married women:

The married women wear a headdress of birch-bark, some two feet high. This they generally cover with a black woolen stuff; but some of the richer women use red silk. The end (of this head-dress) is like a duck; they call it \textit{gugu}. They are in constant fear of people knocking against it, and are obliged to go backwards and crouching through the doorways of their tents.\footnote{Li Chih-Ch’ang [Li Zhichang], \textit{The Travels of an Alchemist}, 67.}
These and the other descriptions correspond to both archaeological and pictorial evidence. In depictions of the wives of officials or consorts of the khan, they inevitably wear the *boqta*, although in the painted renditions of the *boqta* it is the same red of the robes. Unsurprisingly, we do not have evidence for felt-covered *boqta* as these were likely not worn in official contexts or by upper class women. In addition, the only painted versions of the *boqta* that show any sort of detailed decoration are the official portraits of Yuan empresses attributed to Anige (fig. 2.59). On these portraits we find a small tuft of quills crowning the top of the *boqta* as well as pearls and a large jeweled piece in the center of the hat corresponding to the description by William of Rubruck. *Boqta* ornaments have been excavated. In an example found in a Yuan tomb in 2001 (fig. 2.60), gold filigree work and precious inlaid stones give us a well-preserved and impressive example of the potential elaboration of such headdresses. Excavated examples give further confirmation that *boqta* were made with very fine materials. One example currently in a private collection and likely dating to the Yuan period is made of *nasīj* and embroidery and decorated with pearls (fig. 2.61). Another, in the collection of the China National Silk Museum in Hangzhou, also made out of *nasīj*, preserves only the bottom section of the hat (fig. 2.62). These *boqta* give evidence for a further use of *nasīj*, at least in the Yuan, and highlights the shortcomings of using only painted evidence when determining the clothing of certain periods. Here going by the pictorial and textual evidence we would assume that noblewomen only wore the red silk *boqta*, when the excavated record shows us *nasīj* examples as well.
The black felt coverings of the *boqta* described by Li Zhichang connect the elaborate, bejeweled crowns worn by Mongol noblewomen to a more widespread steppe tradition. Examples of towering headgear made of black felt have been uncovered at the site of Subeshi in the Tarim Basin region of present-day Xinjiang Province and date to the fifth to third centuries BCE, though to be sure these are funnel or cone shaped, rather like witches hats worn by children on Halloween, rather than “duck-like”.\(^{327}\)

Archaeological evidence is somewhat lacking for the intervening fifteen hundred years between the Subeshi “witches” and the *boqta*. Thomas Allsen and Gustaaf Schlegel both argue for connections between the *boqta* and a variety of cultures, Schlegel positing the hennin popular in Northern Europe during the 15\(^{th}\) century had some connection to Central Asian styles of headdress.\(^{328}\) Allsen does not subscribe to Schlegel’s hennin hypothesis, but nonetheless connects the *boqta* to traditions fairly far afield both geographically and chronologically.\(^{329}\) A Central Asian connection is likely, but as mentioned, it is difficult to connect traditions separated by centuries. Nonetheless, descriptions exist of comparable dress from slightly later periods. A description of the female dress of the Central Asian Hephthalites which Allsen calls the earliest Chinese


\(^{328}\) G. Schlegel, “Hennins or Conical Lady’s Hats in Asia, China and Europe.” *T’oung Pao*, Vo. 3, No. 4 (1892), 423-424.

\(^{329}\) Allsen (1997), 16-18.
description of such Central Asian headwear, from a text dating to c. 519 CE by the Buddhist pilgrim Huisheng (惠生), sounds quite similar to Mongol female dress:

The royal ladies of the Yeda [Hephthalite] state wear brocaded [robes] that have a three-chi-long train which are held up by attendants. On their heads they wear a horn eight chi in length; three chi of this is rose colored and it has multicolored adornments…the wives of the great ministers also [wear something like this] and from the horn hangs a sort of canopy that covers their heads, like a precious cover, and from this cover we distinguish between the noble and lowly; in addition, dress is regulated.

Here the overlong robes with “brocaded” patterns and “horns” could easily be a precedent for the ample Mongol female robes and boqta. However, without illustrations or archaeological evidence this remains conjecture. Equally intriguing is the illustration from Turfan of the supposedly Uighur woman published by both Grünwedel and von Gabain mentioned briefly in the context of a connection between Uighur and Mongol female dress above (fig. 2.58). This young woman is clearly wearing a boqta, perhaps providing further evidence that this headwear was worn prior to the Mongol period in the
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330 Allsen (1997), 16.
331 “喝達國王妃，亦著錦衣地三尺，使人擎之，頭戴一角長八尺，奇長三尺衣玫瑰五色裝飾其上，。。。自餘大臣妻，皆隨傘頭，亦巾有角團圓下垂，狀似寶蓋，蓋觀其貴賤，亦有服“ From Yang Xuanzhi (楊衒之), Luoyang qielan ji jiaozhu (洛陽伽藍記校注 Annotated Records from the Buddhist Temple in Luoyang) (Shanghai: Guji chuban she, 2011), 288.
Tarim Basin region. Alternatively, this may indicate that the cave in question has paintings dating to the Mongol period.

Conclusion

The establishment of a courtly dress vocabulary, specifically the use of gold-woven textiles, male robes with cinched waists, the ample robe worn by noblewomen, and the boqta, constituted the elements of dress that became easily recognizable as shorthand for Mongols in court paintings in China and illuminated manuscripts in Persia. These styles would be continued and elaborated in the Yuan and Ilkhanate. In addition, in this early period we find the origins of ceremonial uses of clothing, which became an integral part of the increasingly elaborate ritual of the Mongol Empire. We shall explore these themes in greater detail in the coming chapters.
Chapter 3: Yuan Dynasty Court Dress (1260-1368)

The Yuan dynasty (1271-1368) saw the full flourishing of Mongol imperial power and associated ceremony, much of which revolved around court dress. The reign of Khubilai Khan (1215-1294, the Shizu Emperor, r. 1260-1294) was arguably the apex of courtly display, and indeed it will be the focus of this chapter. Khubilai became Kaghan (Great Khan) after a succession of battles from 1259-1264 with his brother, Arigh Böke (1219-1266). The son of Tolui (1292-1232) and Sorghaghtani Beki (d. 1252) and grandson of Chinggis Khan, Khubilai was raised surrounded by a coterie of multiethnic advisers, including Uighurs and Chinese. By the time Khubilai took power, the Mongol court based in Karakorum had been a center of demand for luxury goods for at least two decades. The preceding chapter outlined the evidence for official workshops which produced material for the court, and showed that nasīj was worn, if not produced, in Mongol territories. During the Yuan dynasty, demand for nasīj increased, and the Yuan shi records court production sites in Yuan territory. These workshops, which will be detailed here, became much more regulated during the Yuan. Although clothing regulations were not formally introduced until after Khubilai’s reign, his tenure as Great Khan ushered in a period of elaborate court ceremonial that both set the tone for the rest of the dynasty and survived it in written records of visitors to the court, including Marco Polo (1254-1324).

Sources

Texts from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries referring to Yuan court dress have some overlap with primary sources used in the previous chapter. The standard history of the Yuan dynasty, Yuan shi, is more useful here than for the pre-1260 period, devoting juan, 78 entirely to dress and the Tongzhi tiaoge (通制條格, Code of Comprehensive Institutions), compiled in 1321, provides us with contemporary evidence for clothing regulations.\textsuperscript{335} The Yuan edition of the Southern Song encyclopedia, Shilin guangji (事林廣記, Vast Records of the Forest of Affairs), is illustrated with woodcut prints of Yuan dress such as archery attire, or how an official might be represented in a home setting.\textsuperscript{336} In addition to these Chinese sources, a text published in 14\textsuperscript{th} century Korea, Lao qida (老乞大; Korean: Nogeoldae), a textbook of colloquial Chinese which preserves a northern form of spoken Chinese from the late Yuan-early Ming period, describes dress which we recognize as probably having Yuan origins.\textsuperscript{337}

As with the previous chapter, contemporary non-Chinese texts help fill in the picture of the sartorial customs of the Yuan court. The most famous of these is Marco Polo’s Devisement du monde or “Description of the World,” which was narrated to the

\textsuperscript{335} Tongzhi tiaoge, Yuandai shiliao congkan (series of Yuan materials and history), (Zhejiang: Zhejiang guji chuban she, 1986), juan 9.
\textsuperscript{336} Chen Yuanjing (陳元靚), Xinbian zuantu zenglei qunshu leiyao shilin guangji (新編纂圖增類羣書類要事林廣記) in Xutiao siku quanshu (續條四庫全書) (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chuban she, 1995), vol. 1218.
\textsuperscript{337} The original Chinese text alongside an English translation is published in Rimsky-Korsakoff Dyer, Grammatical Analysis of the Lao Ch’i-ta: With an English Translation of the Chinese Text (Canberra: Faculty of Asian Studies Monographs: New Series No. 3, 1983).
romance writer Rustichello of Pisa while Polo was imprisoned in Genoa around 1298. Questions have been raised about whether Marco Polo actually journeyed to China, and indeed doubts have been cast on his narrative’s veracity since the manuscript was first published. I follow those specialists who argue that Marco did spend a substantial amount of time in China, although his account was almost certainly exaggerated at times. Marco Polo’s account of the world of the Mongol Empire is exceptional for the wide range of experiences of its protagonist as well as its portrayal of Mongols, which to an extent revises contemporary stereotypes held by contemporary Europeans. Another important chronicler of the Mongol period was the Franciscan friar Odoric of Pordenone (c. 1265-1331), whose Travels formed a large part of the source material for the well-circulated writings of the armchair traveler John de Mandeville. Odoric, whose
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339 Frances Wood’s book *Did Marco Polo Go to China?* (London: Sacker and Warburg, 1995) rekindled the debate, concluding that Marco Polo did not travel any further than the Black Sea and Constantinople, citing a number of features common to prior skeptics, including his omission of tea, footbinding, and the Great Wall from Polo’s account. A number of scholars of the Mongol period have responded, taking her arguments to task and providing a wealth of evidence for Marco Polo’s seventeen-year stint in China. See Igor de Rachewiltz, “Marco Polo went to China,” *Zentralasiatische Studien* 27(1997), 34-92; Peter Jackson, “Marco Polo and his ‘Travels’” 82-101.

340 As Suzanne Yeager points out, “Polo and Rustichello effectively reinscribe then-traditional views of ‘eastern’ sites and peoples – no longer the uncivilized denizens of monstrous locales, Polo’s inhabitants operate in a world of sophisticated cities, commerce, and intellectual development. Those things deemed stereotypically ‘heathen’ are correct”; for instance, the Great Khan becomes a reasonable ruler who is said to harbor secret preferences for Christianity – a position which, in the time of the texts’ circulation, would have proven his wisdom and civilized manner. Suzanne Yeager, “The World Translated: Marco Polo’s *Le Devisement dou monde*, The Book of Sir John Mandeville, and Their Medieval Audiences,” in *Marco Polo and the Encounter of East and West*, ed. Suzanne Conklin Akbari and Amilcare Iannucci (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008), 156-157.

narration was recorded in Latin by William of Solagna in Bologna in 1330,342 traveled to Asia in 1318-1330, spending three years in China at Khanbalik (the Yuan capital of Dadu, present-day Beijing).343

The two principle West Asian sources for life under the Mongols that mention textiles and dress are Ibn Battuta’s (c. 1304-1368) *Rihla* (“Book of Travels”), and Rashid al-Din’s (c. 1247-1318) *Jamiʿ al-tawarikh* (*Compendium of Chronicles*). The *Rihla* recounts Ibn Battuta’s travels through Asia, including China, which he visited in 1345-1346.344 Ibn Battuta’s description of dress and its uses in West and Central Asia is more useful than its description of dress in China, which is restricted to dismissive generalities. He writes, for example, “[the people of the Yuan] live comfortably and in affluence but take little care about their food and clothing. You will see an important merchant whose wealth is beyond reckoning wearing a tunic of coarse cotton.”345 The *Jamiʿ al-tawarikh,* an encyclopedic world history, includes details of the Mongols, including customs and practices in the Yuan and Ilkhanid courts.346 Like the *Rihla,* the *Jamiʿ al-tawarikh* is of more use for West and Central Asian dress than for that of the Yuan court. Extant
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342 L. Bressan, “Odoric of Pordenone (1265-1331). His vision of China and South-East Asia and his contribution to relations between Asia and Europe,” *Journal of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society,* vol. 70, No. 2 (273) (1997), 10. For a list of surviving manuscripts of Odoric’s travels, see Bressan, 10-11.


346 For editions used in this dissertation see Chapter 2, 84, note 197.
illuminated copies (and partial copies) of the *Jami' al-tawarikh*, show representations of courtly Mongols as principle actors in its stories. These paintings form the core of our pictorial evidence for Ilkhanid court dress and customs in the following chapter.

Several excavations have yielded textiles from this period. In north China, the most important are the Wang Shixian clan tomb complex in Zhang county, Gansu, with the earliest objects from the mid-thirteenth century; the Gezidong (Dove Cave) in Longhua county, Hebei, from the early-mid fourteenth century; the hoard at Jining lu (Jining district) in Ulanqab, Inner Mongolia from the early fourteenth century; and the tomb of Li Yu’an in Zou County, Shandong dated to 1350. These four tombs are complemented by three tombs in south China: the tomb of Qian Yu, Wuxi, Jiangsu dated 1320; the tomb of Madame Cao, Zhang Shicheng’s mother in Suzhou, Jiangsu dated 1350. See also Zhao Feng, “Silk Artistry of the Yuan Dynasty,” in Dieter Kuhn (ed.), *Chinese Silks* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012), 333.
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349 Pan Xingrong 潘行荣, “Yuan Jining lu gucheng chutu de jiaocang sizhipinwu ji qita,” “元集寧路故城出土的窖藏丝织品及其他” (Silk and other objects excavated from the Yuan hoard at Jining lu), *Wenwu* 8, (1979), 32-35; Li Yiyou 李逸友, “Tan Yuan Jininglu yizhi chutu de sizhipinwu,” “谈元集宁路遗址出土的丝织物” (On the silk textiles excavated from the Yuan site at Jininglu), *Wenwu* 8 (1979), 37-39.
351 For the tomb of Qian Yu see Wuxi Museum 无锡市博物馆, “Jiangsu Wuxi shi Yuan mu zhong chutu yipi wenwu” 江苏无锡市元墓中出土一批文物 (“A Trove of cultural relics excavated from the Yuan tombs of Quxi city, Jiangsu”), *Wenwu* 12 (1964), 52-60+78.
1365,\(^{352}\) and the Chen family tomb in Yuanling, Hunan.\(^{353}\) These give evidence for dress in southern China under the Mongols which generally follows the form of Song clothing rather than adopting Mongol dress. The material provided from the northern and southern sites gives greater scope to our knowledge of dress styles acceptable under the Yuan. In addition to these excavations, important material from the Yuan dynasty is in the collections of the China National Silk Museum in Hangzhou, the Musée Guimet in Paris, the Chris Hall Collection in Hong Kong, and Rossi and Rossi in Hong Kong and London.

There is also a greater quantity of pictorial evidence for dress from this period than from the early Mongol period (pre-1260). Tombs uncovered in north China with polychrome painted murals may be used as comparisons with excavated textiles and textual descriptions. At least twenty-six painted tombs have been unearthed in which Yuan dress is depicted in some detail. While not all of the tombs here studied survive (some were unearthed at construction sites), in cases where they were destroyed there are often adequate color photos.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tomb Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tomb of Feng Daozhen(^ {354})</td>
<td>Datong, Shanxi</td>
<td>1265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{352}\) Suzhou Museum et al. 蘇州博物館等, “Suzhou Wu Zhang Shicheng mu Cao shi mu qingli jianbao,” “蘇州吳張士誠母曹氏墓清理簡報” (Brief report on the excavation of the tomb of Madame Cao, mother of Zhang Shicheng, in Qu county, Suzhou), Kaogu 6 (1965), 289-300.

\(^{353}\) Zhao Feng, “Silk Artistry of the Yuan Dynasty,” 333.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tomb/Location</th>
<th>Location Details</th>
<th>Year(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dongercun tomb[^355]</td>
<td>Pucheng County, Shaanxi</td>
<td>1269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomb M2 at Kangzhuangcun[^356]</td>
<td>Tunliu, Shanxi</td>
<td>1276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomb M1 at the Gear Factory[^357]</td>
<td>Datong, Shanxi</td>
<td>1298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanyanjing tomb[^358]</td>
<td>Chifeng (Ulanhad), Inner Mongolia</td>
<td>Yuan dynasty (13th century)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuanbaoshan tomb[^359]</td>
<td>Chifeng (Ulanhad), Inner Mongolia</td>
<td>Yuan dynasty (13th century)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomb from an eastern suburb of Xi’an[^360]</td>
<td>Xi’an, Shaanxi</td>
<td>1288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomb at the Diesel Engine Plant, East Wenhua Road[^361]</td>
<td>Jinan, Shandong</td>
<td>Yuan dynasty (13th-14th century)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carved stone tomb at Budongcun[^362]</td>
<td>Jinan, Shandong</td>
<td>Yuan dynasty (13th-14th century)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


[^356]: Xu Guangji and Ma Sheng et al., vol 2, 200-202.

[^357]: Tomb is not preserved. Xu Guangji and Ma Sheng et al., vol 2, 203-207.


[^360]: Xi’an Institute of Archaeology 西安市文物保护所, “Xi’an shi dongjiao Yuandai bihua mu,” “西安东郊元代壁画墓” (A Yuan Dynasty Tomb with Murals from the Eastern Suburbs of Xi’an), *Wenwu* 1 (2004), 62-72; Xu Guangji and Yin Shenping et al., vol. 7, 468-474.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dynasty (century)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dazhengxiaoqu</td>
<td>Jinan, Shandong,</td>
<td>Yuan dynasty (13th-14th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>century)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomb at Xingcun in Gonggouzheng</td>
<td>Jinan, Shandong</td>
<td>Yuan dynasty (13th-14th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>century)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomb from the site of the Qilu Hotel at the</td>
<td>Jinan, Shandong,</td>
<td>Yuan dynasty (13th-14th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern foot of Xianfoshan Mountain</td>
<td>preserved in the Jinan</td>
<td>century)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Museum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hualong Road tomb</td>
<td>Jinan, Shandong</td>
<td>Yuan dynasty (13th-14th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>century)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomb at Longshanzhen</td>
<td>Zhangqiu, Shandong</td>
<td>Yuan dynasty (13th-14th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xigoutou tomb at the construction site of the</td>
<td>Zhangqiu, Shandong</td>
<td>century)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhongji Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomb at Xiaokangcun in Gongzhuangzhen</td>
<td>Zhangqi, Shandong</td>
<td>Yuan dynasty (13th-14th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>century)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomb M17 at Nülangshan in Xiuhuizhen</td>
<td>Zhangqiu, Shandong</td>
<td>Yuan dynasty (13th-14th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>century)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomb at Wangshangcun</td>
<td>Dengfeng, Henan,</td>
<td>Yuan dynasty (13th-14th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>preserved in the</td>
<td>century)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zhengzhou Municipal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institute of Cultural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relics and Archaeology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Finally, Chinese court paintings of emperors and empresses presently in the

collection of the National Palace Museum in Taipei fill out the visual evidence of Yuan

---

371 Xu Guangji and Sun Xinmin et al, vol. 5, 214-221.
373 Xu Guangji and Ta La and Sun Jinhua vol. 3, 232.
377 Archaeology Institute of Shanxi 山西省考古研究所, “Shanxi Yuncheng Xilizhuang Yuandai biaohua mu,” “山西运城西里庄元代壁画墓” (Excavation of the Yuan Tomb with Wall Paintings at Xilizhuang in Yuncheng, Shanxi), Wenwu 4 (1988), 76-78, 90.
court dress. In particular, the large hanging scroll, *Khubilai Khan Hunting* (元世祖出獵圖 Yuan shizu chulie tu) by Liu Guandao (劉貫道 act. c. 1279-1300) and a series of imperial portraits attributed to the court artist Anige (阿尼哥 1245-1306), give important evidence for the how the Yuan emperors wished to be portrayed officially. Alongside other court paintings, a small but revealing corpus of imperial commissions takes shape.

**The Organization of Official Yuan Textile Production Offices**

During Khubilai Khan’s reign, the imperial workshops producing court dress and accessories were ordered into at least fourteen departments established approximately between the years of 1261 and 1278. Four of these offices were founded in 1261, the year after Khubilai came to power, and three years before he officially won the succession battle with Arigh Böke. Three more were established between 1263 and 1265. That fully seven of these workshops were established so early in his reign showed a desire to exploit certain Chinese institutions for the benefit of the Mongol Empire. This is indicative of his larger interest in balancing a preservation of “Mongol” customs with the advantages of certain “Chinese” elements, such as the bureaucracy. Khubilai clearly recognized the importance of establishing a courtly dress vocabulary for his court, if not a full-fledged system, even before he conquered the Southern Song and founded the Yuan dynasty.
The workshops are listed here in chronological order, according to the year they were initially established. Most are listed in juan 88 of the Yuan shi, except where noted. They provide a sense of the complexities of the court workshops for textiles and dress.\(^{380}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Office</th>
<th>Date Established/Named</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Originally: Directorate-General of the Office of Rare Textiles *Yiyang ju zong guanfu* 異樣局總管府  
After 1269: Intendancy of the Office of Rare Textiles *yiyang ju ti diansuo* 異様局提點所\(^{381}\) | 1261                   |
|                                                                            | 1269                   |
| Gauze, Gold, and Dyestuffs Treasury *Shajin yanliao zongku* 紗金顏料總庫\(^{382}\) | 1261                   |
| Gold Thread Office *Jin sizi ju* 金絲子局\(^{383}\)                           | 1287 (when two separate gold thread offices, both of which had been founded in 1261, were combined into one) |
| Originally: Office for Rare Embroideries *Yiyang wenxiu ju* 異樣絺絣局  
From 1277: Superindendency for Rare Embroideries *Yiyang wenxiu tijusi* 異樣繡絣提舉司\(^{384}\) | 1261                   |
|                                                                            | 1277                   |
| Imperial Clothing Office *Yuyi ju* 御衣局\(^{385}\)                           | 1263 (first officers were not appointed until 1265) |


\(^{382}\) Farquhar, 86, citing *YS, juan* 88, 2229; *HYS* 59:10b.


\(^{384}\) Farquhar, 86, citing *YS, juan* 88, 2228 and *HYS* 59:10ab

\(^{385}\) Farquhar, 87, citing *YS, juan* 5, 95, 88, 2229 and *HYS* 59:11a
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Wardrobe Office <em>Shang yi ju</em> 尚衣局 (specialized in weaving clothes for the emperor)</td>
<td>1265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shi Dao’an’s Imperial Clothing Office <em>Yuyi Shi Daoan ju</em> 御衣史道安局 (named after Shi Dao’an, a weaver who was said to have organized silk weaving for the Mongols in 1214)</td>
<td>1265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate-General of Civil Artisans in Dadu and Other Circuits <em>Dadu denglu minjiang zongguanfu</em> 大都等路民匠總管府 (oversaw numerous workshops which wove textiles and made clothes for the emperor)</td>
<td>1270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Originally: Gauze Office <em>Shaluo ju</em> 紗羅局 After 1275: Gauze Superintendence <em>Shaluo tijusi</em> 紗羅提舉司</td>
<td>1275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau for the Imperial Dress <em>Beizhang zongyuan</em> 備章總院 (composed of eight other offices, only one, Yang Lin’s Office, <em>Yang Lin ju</em> 楊藺局 identified in the <em>Yuan shi</em>)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau for Imperial Manufactures <em>Jiang zuo yuan</em> 將作院 (coordinated the production of a variety of artisans working with precious metals, jewels, minerals, feathers, rhinoceros horn, ivory, as well as weaving an embroidering textiles)</td>
<td>1278</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

386 Farquhar, 87, citing *YS*, juan 88, 2229 and *HYS* 59:11a
388 Farquhar, 86, citing *YS*, juan 88, 2229 and *HYS* 59:10b
389 Farquhar, 86, citing *YS*, juan 88, 2229 and *HYS* 59:10b
390 Farquhar, 87, citing *YS*, juan 88, 2229 and *HYS* 59:10b-11a
391 Farquhar, 82, citing *YS* 198.
Belt Leather Office *Tingdai xiepi ju* 鞦带斜皮局 1278

Lacquered Gauze Caps Office *Qisha guanmian ju* 漆紗冠冕局 1278

Originally: Brocade Weaving and Dyeing Office *Lingjin zhiran ju* 綾錦織染局
From 1287: Brocade Weaving and Dyeing Superintendency *Lingjin zhiran tijusi* 綾錦織染提舉司 1287

**Nasīj**

The list of imperial workshops and storehouses gives some clues about the production of *nasīj*. Both the Gauze, Gold, and Dyestuffs Treasury and two Gold Thread Offices were founded in 1261. *Nasīj* is not named specifically in this list of workshops, but we read in the following *juan* (89) of the *Yuan shi* that *nasīj* was officially produced in two major centers by the third quarter of the thirteenth century. These were Xunmalin (尋麻林), west of the newly-established Yuan capital of Dadu (大都) in present day Hebei province; and Hongzhou (弘州), about 180 kilometers west of Dadu, which we recall from the last chapter was a luxury textile center beginning with its establishment by

---

392 Farquhar, 84, citing YS, *juan* 88, 2227 and HYS 59:8b
393 Farquhar, 85, citing YS, *juan* 88, 2227 and HYS 59:9ab.
394 Farquhar, 86, citing YS, *juan* 88, 2228-2229 and HYS 59:10b
395 Paul Pelliot agrees with Emil Bretschneider’s argument that Xunmalin was located approximately at the site of the present city of Ximalin (洗麻林). It is likely is the city called Sīmalī in Rashid al-Din’s *Jami' al-tawarikh*. See Paul Pelliot, “Une Ville Musulmane dans la Chine du Nord sous les Mongols,” *Journal Asiatique*, 211 (1927), 261-279. See also Thomas Allsen, *Commodity and Exchange*, 41-43.
396 *YS*, *juan* 89, 2263.
Chinqai in 1229. In addition to these two production centers, Beshbalik, the former Uighur capital, also produced \textit{nasij} during Khubilai’s reign. In \textit{Yuan shi, juan} 85 we read:

The Beshbalik Office [\textit{bieshibali ju} 別失八里局] was ordered into seven levels headed by a Commissioner-in-Chief, and a Vice Commissioner. It supervised the production of the weaving of imperial collars and cuffs made of \textit{nashishi}, and other materials, and was established beginning in the thirteenth year of the Zhiyuan period of the Yuan dynasty [1276].

James Watt points out that this passage indicates that the office was established in 1276 in Beshbalik, when in reality, according to the \textit{Yongle Dadian} (永樂大典 Yongle Encyclopedia, compiled in 1408), the Beshbalik office was moved to Dadu in 1276 due to war with the Chagadids (the Mongol ruling house in Central Asia).

These three workshops appear to have been staffed largely by workers displaced from locations in China and Central Asia, including Herat in present-day Afghanistan, continuing the same practice used by weaving centers established in the pre-Yuan period. As we read in the \textit{Yuan shi}, “in the fifteenth year of the Zhiyuan period of the Yuan dynasty [1278] displaced families, freed slaves, and other households were recruited and all these people were trained as artisan weavers to make \textit{nashishi}; [they

\begin{footnotes}
\item[397] \textit{YS, juan} 120, 2964.
\item[398] \textit{YS, juan} 85, 2149. Also quoted in Allsen, \textit{Commodity and Exchange}, 41.
\item[399] \textit{WSWG} 130-131 and note 17.
\item[400] In the \textit{Tariikh Nama-i-Harat} (The history of Herat) of, Sayf ibn Mu\u{g}ammad ibn Ya'qub al-Harawi wrote that one thousand households of weavers from Herat were sent by Prince Tolui to Beshbalik. See translation of \textit{Tariikh Nama-i-Harat} 106-107 in Allsen, \textit{Commodity and Exchange}, 39. Anne Wardwell also cites Allsen’s translation of Sayf as well as Boyle’s translation of Juvayni, who mentions the forcible resettlement of Central Asian textile workers by the Mongols in “Two Silk and Gold Textiles of the Early Mongol Period,” 364.
\end{footnotes}
were sent] to the two offices at Hongzhou and Xunmalin.\textsuperscript{401} These “patterned brocade offices” were established in the seventh year of the Zhiyuan period (1271).\textsuperscript{402} Nasīj, in many ways the defining textile of the Yuan dynasty, was therefore produced in large quantities near the capital city from early in Khubilai’s reign, which we will keep in mind when discussing the scale of nasīj robing during court ceremonies.

\textit{Zandanījī}

\textit{Nasīj} may have been the definitive fabric of the Mongol court, but it was only one of many textiles produced for courtly consumption. In addition to the types detailed in the previous sections including \textit{kesi}, embroidery, silk damasks, and gauzes, the \textit{Yuan shi} records a new material, called \textit{sadalaqi} (撒答剌欺), a word probably borrowed from the Persian word \textit{zandanījī}.\textsuperscript{403} Exactly what \textit{zandanījī} was is a question that has been debated by textile historians since the mid-twentieth century.\textsuperscript{404} Dorothy Shepherd and

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{401} “至元十五年，招 收析居放良等戶，教習人匠織造納失失，於弘州、蕁麻林二處置局。” \textit{YS}, juan 89, 2263.

\textsuperscript{402} “紋錦局，秩從七品。大使一員，副使一員。國初，以招收漏籍人戶，各管教習立局，領送納絲銀物料織造段匹。至元八年，設長官。” \textit{YS}, juan 89, 2263.


Walter Bruno Hermann Henning put forward a tentative hypothesis about the material form of the textile *zandanījī* based on an inscription that they interpreted as a Sogdian language inscription reading “*zandanījī,*” found on the reverse side of a Central Asian silk in a church in Huy, Belgium. After the publication of their article, samite-woven silks with large roundels from Central Asia (from *circa* the 7th-10th centuries) were often referred to as “*zandanījī*” in textile catalogues, despite the lack of evidence in the texts for *zandanījī* being made of silk in the first place. In the last ten years, articles have been published calling this identification into question, citing the consistency of period texts referring to *zandanījī* as a type of cotton.  

Even if we agree with these new conclusions regarding Central Asian *zandanījī*, namely, that it was certainly not silk, we cannot assume that 7th-10th century Central Asian *zandanījī* was the same fabric as that produced for the Mongol court. What might Mongol *zandanījī* have been?

In the *Yuan shi*, we read:

The Supervisorate of *Sadalaqi* was ordered into five levels headed by a Supervisor-in-Chief, a Vice Supervisor, and a Record Keeper (*Tikong andu* 提控案牘).  
This was established in the twenty-fourth year of the Zhiyuan period of the Yuan dynasty [1287]. Introduced by Zhamalading [札馬剌丁, possibly Jamal al-Din ibn Muhammad al-Najjari, fl. 1251-1290], this was the leading [center]
for artisans producing sadalaqi, and was manufactured in conjunction with the Silk Office (sichou tongju 絲綢同局). [The offices] were later reorganized into the Supervisorate of Silk Producing Artisans and the Supervisorate of Sadalaqi.\textsuperscript{408}

The association of the Sadalaqi office with the Silk Office may indicate that zandanījī in a Yuan context was indeed made of silk, rather than cotton. However, the introduction of sadalaqi by a Central Asian, Jamal al-Din, makes the case for either an exceptional weave of silk, heretofore unknown in China, or a material such as finely-woven cotton, which was rarer than silk during this period in China. On the origins of Yuan sadalaqi, Thomas Allsen follows Francis W. Cleaves, who traces sadalaqi to an unattested Mongolian word, sardragh, from the Turkic sädräk, defined in the eleventh century as “loosely woven cloth.”\textsuperscript{409} I am not convinced by this argument; the Chinese sadalaqi clearly imitates the word zandanījī, and giving the credit for importing the weaving technique to Central Asian indicates that the Yuan shi compilers were signifying a specific Central Asian cloth.

This is not the first reference to zandanījī in a Mongol-period text. Juvayni records zandanījī as one of the types of cloths, which included “gold-embroidered fabrics, cottons, zandanichi,” brought to Chinggis Khan by a trio of Central Asian

---

\textsuperscript{408} YS juan 85, 2149.
The story, wherein the traders attempt to sell their fabrics to Chinggis Khan for a high price and are jailed for this affront, ends with one of them offering the entirety of the textiles to Chinggis as a gift. Chinggis, pleased with this offer, freed the traders, and “commanded that for each piece of gold-embroidered fabric they should be paid a balish of gold and for every two pieces of cotton or zandanichi a balish of silver.”

The distinction made here between cotton and zandanījī is further evidence that zandanījī probably did not refer to a cotton product in the Mongol context, and had an equivalent worth to cotton, but was worth less than gold textiles. Based on this evidence, I hypothesize that zandanījī in the Mongol period referred to either Central Asian silk textiles, or some sort of fine woven cotton, that would have been distinguished from plain weave cotton by the merchants. Without more specific evidence, however, we can only speculate on the material, patterns, and weaves of this fabric.

Male Dress

Imperial dress (mian fu) is described in detail in Yuan shi, juan 78. The description, however, does not depart from those in the Song shi, Liao shi, or Jin shi. This

---


411 The value of the balish, the “money of account” during the Mongol period is uncertain. Boyle notes that a balish is “An ingot of gold or silver. It is the iastoc of Rubruck, which, as Pelliot has shown…is a misreading of *iastoc, i.e. yastuq, the Turkish name for these ingots. Yastuq, like the Persian balish, means literally ‘cushion’. An iascot according to Rubruck (Rockhill, 156) was ‘a piece of silver weighing ten marks’; he does not seem to have known of the gold balish. Boyle in Juvayni, The History of the World-Conqueror, 23 note 14. See also Henry Hoyle Howorth on contemporary reckonings of the value of this currency: Howorth, History of the Mongols from the 9th to the 19th Century: Part 1 The Mongols Proper and the Kalmucks (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1876) Note 3, 279.

412 Juvayni, 78.
is puzzling, for pictorial and excavated evidence point to a markedly different style of
dress for both the Yuan emperor and his officials than that found in prior dynasties. For
example, we read of the mian crown in detail, something the emperor neither wears in
pictorial evidence nor is described as wearing in travel accounts by visitors to the Yuan
court. Nasīj is included in the description of imperial dress, and a wider variety of jewels
are described adorning robes and hats, but the vocabulary used is very similar to that of
previous dynasties. Perhaps the Yuan emperors did occasionally dress as their Chinese
predecessors, but this was in no way the official clothing of the dynasty. We have only to
look at imperially commissioned portraits, such as those attributed to Anige (fig. 3.1) to
see that the Yuan emperors did not wish to portray themselves in a Chinese idiom. The
Yuan shi is perhaps more interesting to consider in light of how the Ming viewed the
Yuan and their dress, which is outside the scope of this present study, and in this chapter
dress will be reconstructed based on the places in which textual, pictorial, and excavated
material overlap.

There were about five variations of male Mongol dress. (1) Robes known as
bianxian, which were discussed in the previous chapter, continued to be worn throughout
the Yuan dynasty and spread as far as Korea in the fourteenth century. Alongside these,
there were (2) robes featuring central motifs or badges, called xiongbei (胸背); (3) robes
featuring long sleeves and underarm openings; (4) short-sleeved over-robes worn over
long sleeved under-robes of a contrasting color; and (5) long sleeved, round-collared
front closing robes. All these were worn with trousers, boots, one of several types of hats,
and occasionally, fur coats. Pictorial evidence exists for all five types, and examples of
most have been excavated as well. A sixth type of clothing, the *jisün/zhisun/zhama* suit will also be discussed in the context of its central role in Yuan banqueting. These dress categories are certainly not absolute. There was much overlap in these robes – *xiongbei* designs might be found on a robe with underarm slits or on a short-sleeved over-robe. However, distinguishing these types gives some clarity to the diversity of clothing worn by men at the Yuan court.

**Bianxian**

*Bianxian* appear not to have altered between the early and later Mongol periods in China – we do not have clear dates for the ribbon iteration or braided waist iterations discussed in the last chapter. I assume the two types coexisted. They are described in *Yuan shi, juan* 78 as one of the types of robes worn by musicians as well as the imperial bodyguard (*keshig*): “The *bianxian* robe consists of a narrow-sleeved upper section, with the waist made up of braided lines and fine pleats.”413 A practical style of dress, the *bianxian* robe may have been favored for a quotidian context, although the numerous examples made of *nasij* from the last chapter show that, as with other types of dress, the model might be dressed up or down, depending on the material. During the Yuan dynasty *bianxian* robes also became increasingly common in Korea, where they were called *chulpi*.414 There was a close connection between the Goryeo dynasty in Korea and the

---

413 *YS, juan* 78, 1941.
414 Monsook Kim, “The Mongol Costumes Adopted in Koryo Costumes from the Thirteenth to the Fourteenth Century,” in *Sichou zhi lu yu yuandai yishu 丝绸之路与元代艺术* (Silk Road and Mongol Yuan Art), (Hong Kong: ISAT/Costume Squad Ltd., 2005), 301.
Mongols, with Korean princesses frequently married off to Mongol khans and Mongol court dress and hairstyles adopted at the Korean court in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries.415

**Clothing Regulations and Xiongbei**

As stated in the previous chapter, official Chinese dress with depictions of dragons and other animals was restricted to use by high officials and the imperial family by the reign of Empress Wu Zetian’s (690-705 CE) reign.416 The use of animals as decorative patterns on textiles in the Mongol period in general and Yuan dynasty in particular was distinguished from the Chinese tradition both in terms of form and significance. In contrast to earlier Chinese dynasties, the rank of Mongol officials was not distinguished by dress, as we recall from Peng Daya and Xu Ting’s observation that, “[The Mongols] do not have distinctions of noble and base ranks in their clothing.”417 In addition, textile historians have argued that the Mongols did not use animal and floral motifs as markers of rank.418 There seem to have been exceptions to this; we recall that the *Tongzhi tiaoge* records that the use of the dragon as a central textile pattern or badge, *xiongbei*, was restricted in the first year of Dade (1297) during Temür Khan’s

---

416 Wang Pu 王溥, *Tang huiyao* 唐會要, part 1, (Taipei: Taiwan shangwu yinshuguan, 1968), juan 32, 582.
417 Translation from Johan Elverskog, “Things and the Qing: Mongol Culture in the Visual Narrative,” (2004), 162. See also *Heida shilüe* (trans. and ed. Erich Haenisch and Yao Ts’ung-wu), Peng Daya and Xu Ting, 121. Original text in *Siku quanshu* v. 423, (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1995), 534 B.
418 See Zhao Feng, “Meng Yuan xiongbei jiqi yuanliu,” 蒙元胸背及其源流 (“A Study on Xiongbei Badges during the Mongol Yuan Dynasty”), in *Sichou zhi lu yu yuandai yishu*, 154.
(Chengzong 成宗, r. 1294-1307) reign. Nonetheless, specific sumptuary regulations were not put into place until the first year of the Yanyou era (1314) during the reign of Ayurbarwada Buyantu Khan (Renzong 仁宗, r. 1311-1320). These limited the five-clawed, two-horned dragon and the phoenix to imperial use and regulated the types of textiles and other materials that could be worn by officials and their wives.

Despite these restrictions, officials and their wives dressed in relative finery. The designs of the dragon and phoenix may have been off limits to officials, but we read in Yuan shi juan 78 that those of the first and second rank were permitted to wear robes with all-over use of gold (not specifically called nasīj here, but this is likely the type of textile referred to); those of third rank were permitted to use repeat patterns in gold; fourth and fifth rank were permitted “cloud sleeves” and belted full-length robes; six and seventh rank could wear patterns with six-petal flowers; eighth and ninth rank were allowed four-petal flowers. In addition, officials in the fifth through ninth ranks were allowed to use

419 “On the twelfth day of the third month of the first year of Dade [1297 CE] it was memorialized: “Regarding the cloth that is sold in the marketplace, the great dragon may only be worn by the emperor, [this includes dragons] with one claw to [dragons with] four claws…the xiongbei central dragon [motif] are of no consequence, and weavers are instructed [to weave them]. Likewise, due to the fact that so many people have started wearing woven robes with large dragons, let a written prohibition [on dragon robes] be spread [throughout the land]; weavers will [also] be instructed to stop [weaving them].” My translation from Tongzhi tiaoge (Zhejiang: Zhejiang guji chuban she, 1986), 134. The same passage is found in Yuan dianzhang, although in the YDZ the date is the 11th day rather than the 12th day. The editors of the YDZ point this out, and defer to the TZTG. See Chen Gaohua et al (eds.), Yuan dian zhang, vol. 4 (Tianjin: Zhonghua shuju, 2011) juan 58, 1963.
Zhao Feng writes that this is the earliest reference to Mongol imperial restrictions on the dragon pattern, as well as the first time the term xiongbei is used. See Zhao Feng, “A Study on Xiongbei Badge during the Mongol Yuan Dynasty”, 143.
420 YS juan 78, 1942.
421 YS juan 78, 1942.
422 YS juan 78, 1942.
silver and iron in their belts.\textsuperscript{423} The regulations continue, detailing the materials permitted to the wives of officials, (Mongol) commoners, and “people of various categories” (\textit{semu ren}).\textsuperscript{424} So while restrictions on the form of dress were not apparently strictly regulated, the materials were, at least in theory, by Renzong’s reign.

Robes featuring animal motifs continued to be popular in the Yuan dynasty, apparently without symbolizing rank as they had in the Tang, Liao, Song, and Jin dynasties. Textiles with animal patterns came in a variety of motifs. Liao and Jin traditions of repeat motifs in teardrop, palmette, circular, and square forms made from a supplementary weft in gold were continued, though they were often transformed to become all-over patterns, with a geometric or floral background in addition to the animal repeat. We see a typical example of such a pattern in a fragment in the Chris Hall collection featuring three-clawed dragons in cloud-bordered palmettes (fig. 3.2). This fragment is made of blue tabby weave silk with a supplementary weft on a paper substrate that was originally gilded. The background pattern is a repeat of small lozenges known in Chinese as \textit{lingwen} (菱紋), the “water caltrop” motif. By filling up the ground of the textile with a small repeat pattern such as \textit{lingwen}, woven using a supplementary weft of gold thread, the robe would appear to be made entirely of gold – not technically \textit{nasīj}, but giving a similar overall effect.

Animal patterns were a central feature of one of the most distinctive official robes of the Yuan period. These robes featured \textit{xiongbei}, a pattern later enclosed in a square or

\textsuperscript{423} \textit{YS juan} 78, 1942.
\textsuperscript{424} \textit{YS juan} 78, 1942-1943.
circle with animal and vegetal motifs always placed on the chest and back of the robe (fig. 3.3). Their popularity outlasted the Yuan dynasty; indeed, one of the clearest examples of a Mongol legacy in the dress of the Ming and Qing dynasties is the so-called mandarin square, which denotes rank. As mentioned previously, however, in the Yuan dynasty, xiongbei were not tied to rank. Extant examples of xiongbei were made with a variety of materials. They were either woven into the fabric of the robe with a supplementary weft in gold or in twill damask, or embroidered. They likely evolved from the central animal patterns on the chests and backs of robes common to court dress in the Liao and Jin dynasties, such as the Liao robe in the Cleveland Museum of Art showing two embroidered phoenixes forming a central roundel (fig. 1.20), and the round Liao or Jin embroidery made with gilded threads of two dragons chasing a flaming pearl in the collection of the Musée Guimet (fig. 1.21) that was likely originally featured as a central pattern on a robe. These were discussed in both Chapters 1 and 2.

425 Zhao Feng catalogues eight extant xiongbei in “Meng Yuan xiongbei jiqi yuanliu” 蒙元胸背及其源流 [A Study on Xiongbei Badge during the Mongol Yuan Dynasty], in Zhao Feng and Shang Gang, ed. Sichou zhi lu yu Yuandai yishu 丝绸之路与元代艺术 [Silk Road and Mongol Yuan Art] (Hong Kong: ISAT/Costume Squad Ltd., 2005), 144-149.
427 Zhao Feng states that xiongbei did not symbolize official rank in the Yuan. See Zhao Feng, “Meng Yuan xiongbei jiqi yuanliu,” 154.
428 Zhao Feng, “A Study on Xiongbei Badge during the Mongol Yuan Dynasty,” 154.
429 Zhao Feng posits that xiongbei derived from central patterns on Jin robes, rather than from any central animal patterns on Liao robes, arguing that the Liao robe patterns were tied to rank, unlike the Jin and Mongol robes with central patterns. The Jin robes he cites as evidence include the “Spring Water” and “Autumn Mountains” robes from Jin shi 43 that I discuss in the section on Jin dress in Chapter 1. He cites the description of the patterns being on the “chest, shoulders and sleeves of the robe” (其胸臆肩袖). See Zhao Feng, “Meng Yuan xiongbei jiqi yuanliu,” 155. I do not believe that we should totally dismiss Liao robes with central animal patterns as in fig. 1.21 as precursors for the xiongbei. In addition, I am not convinced that the “Spring Water” and “Autumn Mountains” robes only featured central patterns. The examples I suggest in Chapter 1 as illustrative of these descriptions from Jin shi 43 feature all-over patterns of animals in a gold supplementary weft.
Xiongbei became an identifying feature of Mongol court dress, as evidenced by their depictions in Yuan court painting and Ilkhanid illuminated manuscripts where they are an essential detail of official and imperial dress. In addition to the eight extant Yuan xiongbei which have been discussed in detail by Zhao Feng,\(^{430}\) xiongbei appear on figures in Liu Guandao’s large hanging scroll Khubilai Khan Hunting (fig. 3.4) in the National Palace Museum, on figures in an anonymous court painting called Judging Horses in the Jilin Provincial Museum (fig. 3.5), and on the imperial donors in the large kesi Yamataka Mandala at the Metropolitan Museum of Art (fig. 3.6). They also abound in the illuminated manuscripts of Rashid al-Din’s Jami’ al-tawarikh, which will be discussed in the following chapter. These works were all court-commissioned. I point out this detail because I do not know of any occupant portrayals in tomb murals which show xiongbei, although many other details of dress may be present. Five figures in Khubilai Khan Hunting wear robes wearing distinct xiongbei, three attendants, the central figure of Khubilai, and Khubilai’s consort Chabi (c. 1227-1281). In Judging Horses two figures wear robes with xiongbei, an attendant figure leading a horse and a central figure seated on a mat made of a lion-skin and edged in black, probably the emperor or khan. The emperors in the Yamataka mandala, Tugh Tëmur (Wenzong 文宗, r. 1328-1329, 1329-1332) and Khutughtu Khan Khoshila (Mingzong 明宗, r. 1329) wear matching xiongbei.

The emperors/khans in each of these portrayals are depicted with a large central dragon motif (fig. 3.7). The dragons featured on the robes of Wenzong and Mingzong

\(^{430}\) Zhao Feng, “Meng Yuan xiongbei jiqi yuanliu,” 144-149.
clearly have five claws. This is a little more difficult to make out on the two paintings, although the dragon in *Judging Horses* also appears to have five claws. The attendant figures in both *Khubilai Khan Hunting* and *Judging Horses* have *xiongbei* with floral motifs (fig. 3.8). The variety of robe types used is striking; we find robes with short sleeves over long sleeves, with side-closing collars; robes with long sleeves that cover the hands also with side-closing collars; and long-sleeved robes with underarm openings. *Xiongbei*, it appears, were not limited to a specific kind of vestment.

**Robes with Underarm Openings**

Robes with underarm openings in the Yuan context are portrayed on three figures in Liu Guandao’s *Khubilai Khan Hunting* (fig. 3.9, fig. 3.10, fig. 3.11), including Chabi, and seen in excavated examples one in the China National Silk Museum (CNSM) in Hangzhou (fig. 3.12), and the other in the collection of Rossi and Rossi in London (fig. 3.13). These robes are called *haiqing* (海青) in post-Yuan Chinese texts, but the term *haiqing* in the Yuan dynasty seemed to refer only to imperial tallies given to official messengers using the *yam* postal system, or to gyrfalcons, a favorite hunting animal (incidentally, also represented in *Khubilai Khan Hunting*). The function of these underarm openings is not entirely clear. They are referred to by Zhao Feng as “all-weather” robes, the idea being that in hot weather the wearer might be able to slip his arms through the openings to create a sleeveless version of this robe, attaching the sleeves at the back.

---

431 There are multiple examples in the YS, see *juan* 4, 73, 74; *juan* 118, 2917 for example.
of the robe to get them out of the way.\textsuperscript{432} I have never seen depictions or read
contemporary descriptions of this use of these robes, but the openings on the robe in the
CNSM appear large enough to slip an arm through. Practical uses aside, robes with
underarm openings are likely tied to a broader, more symbolic, Central Asian use.

Elfriede Knauer traces the origins of robes with over-long sleeves and underarm
openings to “Indo-European peoples roving the Asian steppe sometime at the end of the
second millennium BCE.”\textsuperscript{433} The robes on which Knauer focuses, excavated in the
cemetery at Antinoopolis in Egypt, possibly from the fourth through sixth centuries CE,
predate the Yuan robes by several centuries. Knauer also describes thirteenth through
fifteenth century depictions of these coats in Western and Eastern Europe, Anatolia, and
West Asia, which illustrates how widespread they were prior to and during the Mongol
period.\textsuperscript{434} While these coats may have originated from the same Indo-European source,
they vary in form and, possibly, function. Most significantly, the sleeves of the
Antinoopolis coats were far too long and thin to be actually used. In this style of coat, an
arm could not physically fit through the opening, and in some cases the sleeve was sewn
shut at the end.\textsuperscript{435} Such coats were likely worn over the shoulders, in cape-like fashion,
with the arms left to dangle down the sides.\textsuperscript{436} Pre-Mongol evidence for this type of robe

\textsuperscript{432} Zhao Feng in Zhao Feng and Jin Lin (eds.), \textit{Gold/Silk/Blue and White Porcelain}, 53.
\textsuperscript{433} Elfriede R. Knauer, “A Quest for the Origin of the Persian Riding Coats: Sleeved Garments with
Underarm Openings” in Fluck and Vogelsang-Eastwood (ed.), \textit{Riding Costume in Egypt: Origins and
\textsuperscript{434} Knauer, “A Quest for the Origin of the Persian Riding Coats,” 16-19.
\textsuperscript{435} Knauer, “A Quest for the Origin of the Persian Riding Coats,” 9.
\textsuperscript{436} Knauer, “A Quest for the Origin of the Persian Riding Coats,” 8-10.
in China only exists on tomb figurines depicting Central Asians from the Tang dynasty (fig. 3.14), but this style does not appear to have been adopted by East Asian groups.\footnote{Knauer, “A Quest for the Origin of the Persian Riding Coats,” 10.}

In contrast to these earlier Central Asian robes, all the sleeves of robes with underarm slits depicted in *Khubilai Khan Hunting* fit on the actual arms of the figures. On one attendant, and on Chabi, the sleeves are over-long, covering both hands of the attendant, and one of Chabi’s hands. This does not impede the attendant’s ability to hold a stick (or riding crop), with which he gestures skyward, in his right hand, and the reigns of his horse in his left hand. Chabi, likewise, holds onto the reigns with her covered hand, gripping them more firmly with her uncovered hand. The only indication of the openings is the under-robe that peaks through at each armpit. The two excavated examples appear to have sleeves that could actually be worn as well. The robe with underarm openings that is preserved in the China National Silk Museum has a repeat pattern of teardrop shaped motifs that is now faded, which was probably woven with a gilded lamella of animal substrate. It has a round collar, and closes to the right with a set of ties at the waist. The sleeves do not appear to be overly long, nor are they excessively thin. In fact, in general appearance, this robe looks like a typical Mongol-era long-sleeved robe (a variation of the *bianxian* robe) with the addition of underarm openings. The robe in the Rossi and Rossi collection is woven of twill damask with couched appliqué designs on the shoulders of a flower in a roundel with a pattern of scrolling cloud or vine-like elements. It, too, has a round collar, and closes on the right with ties. At a total width of 224 cm, the sleeves are quite long (the *nasīj bianxian* robe from the Chris Hall Collection
- fig. 2.42 from the last chapter - has a width of 189 cm, as a comparison), and might well have fallen over the hands when worn. Adding to the evidence for the fashion of wearing the sleeves of the robe pinned at the back in warm weather is a button located in the center of the back of the robe where the sleeves could be attached.\(^{438}\)

An extant predecessor for these Mongol robes, with sleeves that apparently could be worn on or off the arm is from Moskavaja Balka and preserved in the Abegg-Stiftung in Riggisberg (Inv. No 5357) (fig. 3.15). Attributed to ninth-tenth century Central Asia, it is woven of samit, weft-faced compound twill. It has a round, a high collar, with tapering sleeves and underarm openings. This robe would have fit tightly on the upper body, with a flaring skirt slit at the back to facilitate movement. Decorated with roundels with confronted birds on a luminous yellow silk background, it resembles Liao dynasty robes with roundels in tailoring and design. We have no evidence that the Liao wore this type of robe, however, and must hypothesize that such robes came to the Mongols via Central Asia. We will see in the following chapter that these underarm openings on robes are much more frequently depicted in an Ilkhanid setting, usually on the figure of the khan. While there is no correlation apparent between underarm openings and the emperor or khan in the Yuan environment, in the Ilkhanid context this style may have been reserved mostly for royalty.\(^{439}\)

\(^{438}\) Zhao Feng, *Gold/Silk/Blue and White Porcelain*, 53.

Short-Sleeved Over-Robes

Looking at xiongbei we have already seen depictions of short-sleeved over-robies worn over long-sleeved under-robies of a contrasting color. An archer on horseback wears a green version in Khubilai Khan Hunting (fig. 3.9), both figures with xiongbei from Judging Horses wear them, in blue and green respectively, and the emperors in the Yamataka Mandala wear them in red and white. Other portrayals without xiongbei are found in tomb murals, such as in a portrayal of tomb occupants in the tomb at Houdesheng in Inner Mongolia (fig. 3.16), and a servant figure in a Yuan tomb at Zhoumacun in Shanxi from the 11th year of Dade (1307 CE) (fig. 3.17). In the tomb at Houdesheng, the male occupant is seated in a chair and wears an ochre, long-sleeved under-robe and a white-grey, short-sleeved over-robe. His two male attendants are clad in similarly tailored robes, in red and blue, respectively. The occupant figure and his attendants also wear brimmed hats and black boots. The servant figure in Zhoumacun stands, wearing a green short-sleeved over-robe, a white long-sleeved under-robe, black boots, and a brimmed hat.

To my knowledge, no short-sleeved robes have been excavated, although they are one of the most ubiquitous types of Mongol dress portrayed in paintings. Mongols are almost always portrayed in this combination of short and long-sleeved robes in Persian manuscripts from the Ilkhanid and later periods, as we will see in the next chapter. In the Yuan context, these short-sleeved robes close to the side, usually the right (the tomb mural featuring the servant closes on the left), creating a v-shaped neckline, which shows to varying degrees the round-necked under-robe. The over-robe is slit up both sides,
showing the long-sleeved under-robe underneath. In depictions where the figure is standing, the robe falls above the ankle, showing boots underneath.

**Long-Sleeved Robes**

The front-closing, round collared, long-sleeved robe worn with a thin belt was the most basic type of robe represented in the Mongol period. We find countless examples of these represented in tombs, but also in literati paintings. One example is found on the male tomb occupant in the mural of the occupant couple seated beside a table from a Yuan tomb at the Smelting Plant in Iron and Steel, Xingtai, Hebei (fig. 3.18). Another is portrayed on a musician in the Yuan tomb from 1310 at Xilizhuang, Shanxi (fig. 3.19). In literati paintings they are uniformly found on figures of “Han” grooms and, such as in Zhao Mengfu’s (1254-1322) *Groom and Horse* (fig. 3.20). These robes are clearly the same type represented in the Liao and Jin paintings. Examples are widespread in tomb murals such as the robes worn by servants and occupants in tomb murals from the Liao cemetery in Xuanhua, Hebei (fig. 3.21), and Jin tomb M2 at Shizhuangcun, Hebei (fig. 3.22). However, I have yet to find an extant robe of this type from any of these dynasties.

Considering the variety and level of detail given to representations of clothing in these tombs and Zhao Mengfu’s painting, I do not think these robes were merely shorthand for some other type of dress. Nor were they uniquely represented in tombs in Hebei – we have an example above from Shanxi, and find them in murals in Shandong and Henan, as well as in literati paintings from the south of China. They do not appear to be a marker of social status– tomb occupants, servants, musicians, scholars, and grooms
are shown wearing this sort of robe. Perhaps one can make an argument for them being an ethnic marker – in the Yuan dynasty, very few clearly “Mongol” figures – which I determine not only by robe type, but also by hat and hairstyle – wear them. Hebei, Shanxi, Shandong, and Henan may have had larger populations of non-Mongols in positions of power allowing them to fund an elaborate burial. After all, non-Mongols were not obligated to wear Mongol dress during the Yuan dynasty. I should also note that I count “Mongol” figures to be anyone presenting as Mongol, without regard to his or her actual “ethnicity;” as Nancy Steinhardt has pointed out, there are murals in which the figures wearing Mongol dress are likely to be Han. The front-closing long-sleeved robes are always represented as monochrome and undecorated, and often paired with a black gauze hat which also is a trademark of Han rather than Steppe dress. This leads me to hypothesize that the robes were not fine enough to consider preserving either as a burial good, or in a monastery or church treasury, but were in fact worn during the Yuan period.

**Fur Coats**

Silk and *nasīj* may have been considered the epitome of luxury under the Yuan, but ermine and sable continued to convey prestige and power throughout the dynasty, as it had for the Liao court. We see this illustrated in the figure of Khubilai Khan in *Khubilai Khan Hunting*, who wears an ermine coat over his luxurious gold-woven red

---

silk robe. Fur coats are not mentioned specifically in *Yuan shi, juan* 78, regarding imperial dress, but we find them listed as part of other lavish rewards for meritorious military service under Khubilai. For example, in *Yuan shi, juan* 9, we read that a company of soldiers were gifted “coats made of ermine, sable, and leopard furs” alongside precious metals, paper currency (*chao* 鈔), and textiles. In addition, furs had their own office: the Superintendency for the Office of Ermine and Sable (*diaosu ju tijusi* 貂鼠局提舉司) was established in 1283, around the same time that several of the textile offices and superintendencies were established.\(^{443}\)

**Belts**

The five types of robes described above were always paired with hats, belts, trousers, and boots, and these came in a variety of shapes, sizes, materials, and colors. As introduced in the first and second chapters, belts had an important function, both practically and ceremonially, among peoples of Central Asia and the steppe. We recall from the previous chapter that for the Mongols the belt was literally a symbol of the Khan’s power. A variety of belts, practical and more decorative or ceremonial in function existed at the Yuan court. There are pictorial depictions which may correspond to certain types of belts. An example is a thin belt, sometimes shown plain, sometimes with small sections of metal or jade inlay. We find such belts represented in tomb mural and court paintings, such as a on standing attendant figure in the Yuan tomb at Wangshangcun in

\(^{442}\) *YS, juan* 9, 193. Furs are also listed as part of rewards in *YS, juan* 139, 3146; *YS, juan* 139, 3351; *YS, juan* 169, 3973; *YS, juan* 172, 4022. Thanks to Geoffrey Humble.

\(^{443}\) *YS, juan* 90, 2294.
Dengfeng, Henan currently in the Zhengzhou Municipal Institute of Cultural Relics and Archaeology (fig. 3.23), and on the figure of the archer from Khubilai Khan Hunting (fig. 3.9).

In Khubilai’s time, the type of belt most commented on by European travelers was a wide belt woven with gold. Marco Polo notes that at Khubilai’s birthday feast, “[Khubilai] has also given to each of [his] twelve thousand barons a belt of gold.” These continued to be worn later in the dynasty: Odoric of Pordanone records that all of the Khan’s “barons” are “girt with golden girdles half a foot broad.” No pictorial or archaeological evidence of these wide golden belts has surfaced to my knowledge, although they may have been about the size of the red cloth belt worn by one of the figures on horseback in Khubilai Khan Hunting (fig. 3.8). The male tomb occupant in Yuan tomb M1 at Shazishan, in Chifeng, Inner Mongolia, also appears to be wearing a broad sash-like belt along with a thinner belt (fig. 2.53). There is reason to believe there were several types of wide belts such as these. In addition to descriptions of the golden belts in the texts, the Yuan shi notes that the emperor’s “large belt [da dai 大帶] was made of red and white luo gauze that was sewn together.”

Belt types worn in the Mongol period continued into the late fourteenth century, the early Ming dynasty. Lao qida, the Korean guide to colloquial Chinese, includes a

---

445 “Then the great Khan sitting on his throne, all his barons present themselves before him, with wreaths and crowns upon their heads, being variously attired, for some of them are in green, namely, the principal; the second are in red, and the third in yellow, and they hold each man in his hand a little ivory table of elephant’s tooth, and they are girt with golden girdles half a foot broad, and they stand upon their feet keeping silence.” Odoric of Pordanone in Komroff, 242.
446 YS, juan 78, 1931.
detailed description of what one should wear when traveling to China. For the section on belts, the author is very specific:

As to girding the waist, it should also be according to the four seasons. In the spring wear a gold belt. In the summer wear [a belt with] a jade hook. The lowest [quality] is green jade, the highest is white jade. In the autumn wear [a belt with] a gold alloy hook. Do not use the ordinary kind, always [use] ones with elegant designs. In the winter wear [a belt made of] gold and ornamented with precious stones; also wear a belt with holes [made of] black rhinoceros hide.447

The description of these belts echoes the more elaborate types of belts worn by the emperor, described in Yuan shi, juan 78. In the Yuan shi there is a distinction made between ivory and jade – the former perhaps confused or conflated with “white jade” in the Lao qida. Jade and ivory were especially favored as pendants and belt hooks, while precious metals such as gold and silver were hammered into zoomorphic faces: “The ivory pendant was attached with a semi-circular jade pendant, under the fine gem placed at the top of the belt there were zoomorphic faces made from silver, gilded in yellow gold, and a pair of semi-circular jade pendants in two layers. Each was hung in order, with the ivory pendant at the bottom. They were hung closely together in pairs in order to chime together, and were made of jade.”448 Examples of jade belt hooks have survived from the Yuan dynasty, one still attached to its thin silk belt was uncovered in the tombs

447 Lao qida, 465.
448 YS, juan 78, 1931.
of the Wang Shixian clan in Gansu (fig. 3.24). On it, we see that the jade hook that serves to clasp the belt at the front was zoomorphic in shape.

Hats

Hats were no less important in the Mongol sartorial vocabulary than belts. As noted above, hats, along with hairstyles, were a definitive marker of ethnic difference during this period. Several types of hats were commonly depicted in the Yuan period: a brimmed hat resembling a modern safari hat in shape (fig. 3.25); a tall hat that recalls a lampshade (fig. 3.26), hoods; and head wrappers, worn by themselves or under other hats (fig. 3.9). These head coverings appear to have come in various fabrics depending on the season and occasion, from wool and fur based, to nasīj. In addition to these typical “Mongol” hats, black gauze caps of the Han style continued to be worn (fig. 3.19). Safari-style hats (fig. 3.27), lampshade-shaped hats (fig. 3.28), and hoods (fig. 3.29) have all been excavated. As we can see in most of the figures we have looked at so far, including the figures in *Khubilai Khan Hunting, Yamataka Mandala, Judging Horses,* and the male tomb occupants portrayed in tomb murals, Mongol men wore their hair in looped braids behind the ears. The hat most frequently worn by the emperor was a variation of the safari-style hat, called *dazi nuan mao* (答子暖帽). As described in *Yuan shi, juan* 78, these brimmed hats were matched in material to the robe worn for the occasion.449

449 *YS juan* 78, 1938.
The *Lao qida* gives us information about seasonal appropriateness and materials of the hats one should wear when visiting fourteenth-century China, along with the approximate price of each: “on the head wear the hood of a good sable cap [or] a large good-quality hat with tassels and a gold button on top. All told, such a hat is four taels\(^{450}\) of silver. There are also thick silk, double-peaked hats with a white jade button on top. All told, such a hat is three taels of silver. There are also hats made of sky-blue thick silk, Yünnan felt hats, and sable and fox-fur hats. They all have gold buttons on top.”\(^{451}\) The hats described were of fine quality; in Yuan dynasty figurative portrayals, the only figures wearing hats with gold buttons or finials on the top are the central figures of the Khan—others may have a finial, tassel, or a feather, but not apparently made of gold. This is true for the figures in *Judging Horses, Yamataka Mandala*, and *Khubiliat Khan Hunting*.

**Boots**

Boots were essential to horse riding and the cold climates of north China and Mongolia and were worn by men and women. As with the boots we saw in the Liao dynasty, boots in the Yuan could come in a variety of designs, but were generally of a dark leather, sometimes embellished with embroidery. We see particularly fine boots depicted on all of the figures in *Khubilai Khan Hunting*. *Lao qida* specifies boots for every season, as it does hats and belts:

---

450 Dyer does not translate the term *liang*, but the standard English translation is tael, a unit of weight for currency that fluctuated even within a single dynasty.

As to wearing boots, in the spring wear leather boots made of black deer-skin with a design of inverted clouds sewn on them. In summer wear leather boots made of badger skin. When winter comes wear leather boots made of white deer-skin with inlaid gold thread and blue strips. As to felt socks, one should wear good wool socks bordered with red thick silk. A pair of boots should have wild-goose claws made from red embroidery floss on them, and the sole of the boots should all be two-layered clean soles, stitched with rope and waxed. If the awl is fine and the rope is thick, stitched in this way [the soles] will be especially strong and beautiful.

This passage is interesting not only for the detail of the materials used and designs favored on the boots, but also because we have a description of the manufacturing process of boots here. As with the hats and belts, the boots described are of very fine quality.

Female Dress

Female dress did not appear to change radically between the period of empire formation and the founding of the Yuan dynasty. Mongol women continued to wear ample robes and the boqta on their heads. We see with the depiction of Chabi in Khubilai Khan Hunting that at least the empress would have been allowed to wear xiongbei (robes)

---

452 Dyer translates the term rong 绨 as “velvet,” but since velvet was a relatively new weave in the fourteenth century I doubt that it would have been used to decorate boots. Rong can indicate any kind of soft textile with a nap pile, soft wool, or fine hair, or down, and embroidery floss as well.

453 Lao qida, 466-467.
and robes with underarm openings in addition to more specifically female style dress. As was the case with male dress, Mongol-style dress was not imposed on the general population, and Song-style Chinese dress continued to be worn in southeast China. In addition, the second half of the Yuan dynasty saw regulations in female dress equivalent to those imposed on male dress. We will first look at these regulations, and later show examples of the range of female dress worn in China under the Yuan dynasty.

The regulations imposed on female dress in Renzong’s 1314 decree were much the same for the emperors’ officials as for their wives. Regarding the dress of noble women, those of first through third rank were permitted to wear clothing with all-over patterns in gold; fourth and fifth rank were allowed gold repeat patterns; and sixth rank and below only clothing “sprinkled with gold” [xiaojin 銷金] and with gilded patterns on gauze. This last category of gold adornment may refer to textiles that were stamped, rather than woven with gold. Produced from at least the Liao dynasty, these stamped textiles feature repeating animal motifs familiar to us from textiles woven with a supplementary weft in gold. They continued to be produced in the Yuan dynasty, as we can see from a fragment with a recumbent stag in front of plants or trees stamped in gold on a green tabby weave background forming a checkerboard pattern (fig. 3.30). The 1314 regulation continues, “[Regarding] jewelry, [women] of the first through third rank are permitted to use gold, pearls, jewels, and jade; [those of] the fourth and fifth rank may

454 YS juan 78, 1942.
use jade and pearls; and sixth rank and below may use gold in addition to earrings made of jade and pearls."\(^{455}\)

**Han and Mongol Female Dress**

Women during the Yuan dynasty wore Mongol and Song style dress. As with male dress, who wore what seems to have been determined by the geographical location and political leanings of individual and family, rather than “ethnicity.” As we see from the clothing regulations imposed by the Yuan emperors, they did not force the Han or the *semu* populations into wearing Mongol dress, although there seems to have been some cultural “cross-dressing”: political status was likely associated with Mongol style, as they were the ruling elite.\(^{456}\) In this section, we will distinguish between Mongol and Song styles of clothing, but it is important to keep in mind that the type of clothing worn was not necessarily indicative of ethnicity.\(^ {457}\)

\(^{455}\) *YS juan* 78, 1942.

\(^{456}\) This cultural “cross-dressing” has to do with a larger trend of assuming a Mongol identity by Han subjects. Non-Mongols were barred (at least legally if not in reality) from specific high-ranking political positions (such as *darughachi*), and the adoption of a Mongol persona would almost certainly have helped non-Mongols achieve higher status. Mongol names were adopted by non-Mongols, earlier in the Yuan these were bestowed on subjects by the emperor and later, some Chinese subjects took Mongolian names voluntarily. See Elizabeth Endicott-West, *Mongolian Rule in China: Local Administration in the Yuan Dynasty* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Council on East Asian Studies, 1989), 80-83. For examples of the adoption of Turco-Mongol names by people whose inscriptions describe them as “Han” see: Biography of Jia Shira 賈昔剌, *YS*, juan 169, 3969; Yu Ji 虞集, ‘Xuanhuiyuan shi jiagong shendaobei 宣徽院使賈公神道碑 (The Spirit-Way Inscription of Duke Jia, Commissioner of the Bureau for Household Provisions),” in Daoyuan xue gulu 道園學古錄 (Electronic Siku quanshu edition), 17.9b–17a.; Wang Yun 王惲, “Dayuan jiayi daifu qianshu xuanhuiyuan shi jiashi shide zhi bei 大元嘉議大夫簽書宣徽院事賈氏世徳之碑 (Stele on the Generations of Virtuous Service by Jia, Grandee of the Thirteenth Class and Junior Assistant Director of the Palace Provisions Commission of the Great Yuan),” in Quanyuanwen 全元文 (Complete Yuan Literature), ed. by Li Xiusheng 李修生, 60 vols. (Nanjing: Jiangsu guji chubanshe, 1999), vi, 394–97. Thanks to Geoffrey Humble.

\(^{457}\) The issue of cultural “cross-dressing” in the Mongol period is intriguing, and appears to be somewhat widespread at least in North China, considering the depictions of Han tomb occupants dressed as Mongols.
Wang Yehong has classified dress worn by Yuan dynasty women into four basic types of robes, six types of shirts or jackets, three types of skirts, and two types of trousers. She includes both excavated and pictorial representations of Yuan dynasty women in her classifications. Women in both north and south China wore trousers under their ensembles, topped by a skirt, a robe, and a jacket. Here we will focus on the elements we are able to match with pictorial representations – jackets and robes.

The robes that have been excavated in north China (ie. Inner Mongolia, Hebei, Shaanxi), and are more frequently portrayed in northern tomb murals, are the more “Mongol” style, the ample robes with wide sleeves that tapered at the wrists (fig. 2.54). When laid flat, we see the silhouette of the robe and sleeves are very wide, but when portrayed on female figures, such as the female occupant in the Dongercun tomb (Shaanxi) from 1269 (fig. 2.50), or the female occupant in tomb M1 in Shazishan in Chifeng (Inner Mongolia) (fig. 2.51), the robe appears simply to fall in folds around the body, and sleeves bunch up above the wrist. The female tomb occupant from M1 in Shazishan tucks her hands into her sleeves, while the Dongercun occupant shows her hands. Neither woman wears the robe with a belt, and both portrayals show the robes closing on the left. The female occupant from M1 in Shazishan wears a short jacket over and later bans against Mongol dress in the Ming dynasty (see Conclusion). It is distinct from earlier iterations, such as the practice of Tang men and (earlier in the dynasty) women dressing as Xianbei, discussed by Kate Lingley (See Lingley, “Naturalizing the Exotic: On the Changing Meanings of Ethnic Dress in Medieval China,” *Ars Orientalis*, vol. 38 (2010), 50-80), which started as a fascination for the exotic in China and changed into a form of acceptable dress later in the dynasty. In the Mongol period, Han, Khitan, Jurchens, and others who dressed as Mongols were not doing so out of a desire to present as exotic, but more likely as a show of political allegiance.

her robe with half-sleeves. It has no collar and opens in the front. Such jackets have been excavated in Shandong, Hebei, and Inner Mongolia (fig. 3.31). Although the female tomb occupant from M1 in Shazishan lacks a boqta, her dress associates her with Mongol style, something reinforced as well by her earrings, traditionally a marker of the non-Han “other” in China.459

The robes and jackets excavated from south China (Jiangsu) show a preference for a slimmer style of robe, with thin sleeves, and a side closing (fig. 3.32). The jackets worn with these robes open in the front, but are also narrow in cut, with longer, thinner sleeves. Sleeveless vest-type jackets with front openings were also worn, such as a preserved example in the China National Silk Museum (fig. 3.33). Pictorial representations of women wearing long-sleeved, closer fitting, yet still flowing robes paired with fitted long-sleeved jackets are found in the tomb murals in Shanxi, such as the maids serving tea in tomb M2 at Kangzhuangcun in Tunliu from 1276 (fig. 2.52). The women portrayed wearing this style dress do not have their ears pierced, and on their heads wear bows and decorative flower-shaped hairpieces rather than hats. The sleeveless vest-type jacket is also portrayed pictorially in tomb M1 at Kangzhuangcun also in Tunliu, Shanxi from 1306 (fig. 3.34). It is worn by a maid lighting a lamp, and is layered over both a long sleeved red jacket and a beige robe. That this southern-style dress is consistently represented on maids and servants may be an indication of the lower social

459 Tsao Hsingyuan shows that while Neolithic excavations demonstrate that earrings were worn in what is now considered China, they were always a “symbol of non-Chineseness.” See Tsao Hsingyuan, “From Hair to Ear: Head Ornaments Represented in Chinese Art as Signs of Cultural Identity,” Orientations, 28, (March, 1997) 79-87, 81.
status Han Chinese had during the Mongol period, reinforcing the hypothesis that Mongol dress indicated political and social power.

A final, major, difference in “Mongol” and “Han” dress was the practice of foot-binding, which, according to archaeological evidence, appears to have begun in the Southern Song dynasty. Mongol women did not bind their feet, and in the tradition of other Steppe women, often wore boots. There are many examples of small and delicate embroidered silk slippers or shoe covers from the Yuan dynasty for unbound feet such as numbers 3238 (fig. 3.35) and 3239 (fig. 3.36) in the China National Silk Museum, which are 26 cm and 18 cm long, respectively. As a comparison, shoes or slippers for bound feet are generally about 13-14 cm in length. Boots, while practical and often worn, were therefore not the only option for women with unbound feet during the Yuan dynasty.

**Ceremonial Use of Dress**

Now that we have some idea of the fabrics and types of dress worn in the Yuan period, some attention should be paid to the ceremonial use of these objects. Textiles were exceptionally important for the Mongols, and played a central role in court ceremony. The giving and receiving of clothing by a Mongol ruler to those who served him, noted in the previous chapter, continued in the Yuan dynasty to be the equivalent to a binding contract of service and loyalty between khan and officials. This custom was

---


not unique to the Mongols, and in fact appears to have been prevalent across Central Asia from the early centuries of the Common Era. Indeed, the traditions of honorific robing practiced by nomadic and semi-nomadic groups in northeast Asia seem to have originated in Central Asia. As outlined by Stewart Gordon, the six main features of Central Asian robing include: (1) personalized presentation, that is, from the leader to his men; (2) public presentation, from the leader to individual in front of the rest of the group; (3) robes made of fine materials given as gifts alongside other war booty; (4) a connection between robing and gifting of one or more horses; (5) the tailoring of the robe—a garment fit for an equestrian rather than a wrapping or draped textile; (6) the accompaniment of the robe and a gold object. At the Yuan court we find at least the first, second, fifth features consistently, with the sixth present if we consider the fact that gold and textiles were joined into single objects in the Mongol period. Horses were key to the Mongol lifestyle and war machine, although the third and fourth features were probably more prevalent prior to the founding of the Yuan, when expansionist policies were still at the core of the Mongol rule.

In the Yuan dynasty, honorific robing is best understood if we explain its context. That is how it was transformed from a practice of basic gifting as allegiance marker to an elaborate display of imperial majesty at Khubilai’s court. When the Mongols became rulers of China (and, as we will see in the next chapter, Persia), they faced the problem of

---

Thomas Allsen posits Mongol desire for gold textiles as coming from Central Asia as well in *Commodity and Exchange in the Mongol Empire*, 11-12.
establishing a system of majestic ritual and ceremony for their newly founded courts. One of the simplest ways of establishing such a system was by borrowing elements from the courts of the places they had conquered. Parsing out the origins of these ceremonies helps us better understand how the Mongols manipulated visual spectacle for political means. To this end, we will look in detail at a suit of clothes called in Mongolian, ĵisūn.

**Jisūn – Zhisun – Zhama Banquets**

Yuan court ceremonies are described in contemporary Chinese and European sources. The most important of these was the ĵisūn or, as it was known in Chinese, zhisun (質孫/只孫) banquet. These banquets were named for the suit of clothes (hat, belt, and robe) that each of the attendees wore, which had been gifted prior to the banquet by the khan. These robes are described in detail in the *Yuan shi* and were worn by officials and by the emperor. ĵisūn in Mongolian means “color” and in the *Yuan shi*, ĵisūn robes are defined as being of one color. They were made from various fine materials, including nasīj, and embellished with pearls and precious stones. The emperor had eleven such suits for winter and fourteen for summer, while high officials had nine for winter and fourteen for summer.

---

465 Han Rulin 韓儒林, “Yuandai zhama yan xin tan” 元代詐马宴新探 (New studies on the zhama feast in the Yuan dynasty), in Han Rulin (ed.), *Qionglu ji* (穹廬集) (Shanghai: Shanghai remin chuban she, 1982), 251.
466 *YS*, juan 78, 1938; *WSWG*, 138.
468 *YS*, juan 78, 1938.
469 *YS juan* 78, 1938.
Jisün banquets were held to celebrate a variety of occasions, including imperial birthdays, the ascension of a new emperor to the throne, the bestowing of certain honorific titles on a minister or someone in the imperial family, New Year’s day, the spring hunt, and the fall hunt. Marco Polo describes a birthday feast of Khubilai Khan in which he describes the suits of clothing gifted to the Khan’s “twelve thousand barons”:

[Khubilai has given to each of these twelve thousand men] thirteen robes, each of a color different the one from the other; and they are decked with pearls and with stones and with other rich things very nobly, and they are of very extremely great value. He has also given to each of these twelve thousand barons a belt of gold, very beautiful and of great value. And again he gives to each [boots made of] camut [camlet], worked very cunning with silver thread, which are very beautiful and dear. And at each feast of the thirteen it is ordered which of these robes must be worn. And also the great lord has thirteen of them like his barons, that is in color; but they are more noble and of greater value and better adorned.

This description of zhisun suits fits that of the Yuan shi in both form and quantity, and our idea of the accompanying ceremony or banquet.

---

470 Han Rulin, “Yuandai zhama yan xin tan,” 247.
471 “Camlet (chamlett) was associated with camel hair but this may be a false etymology; it was perhaps derived from Arabic khamlat, from khaml – the nap or pile on a cloth. In the 14th century it was used of a silk cloth.” Gale R. Owen-Crocker, ”Naming of cloths.” Encyclopedia of Medieval Dress and Textiles (Brill Online, 2016) Reference. University of Pennsylvania. 12 February 2016
472 Marco Polo, section 89-90, 225-226. I have not included the italicized sections of this version of the text, which are the parts not included in the Giovanni Battista Ramusio (1485-1557) or Henry Yule (1820-1899) editions. I made this choice because the italicized parts of the text give editorial explanations that I do not believe are entirely accurate, although I include certain interpretations in brackets.
The *jisün* banquet was also known during the Mongol period as the *zhama* (詐馬) banquet, from the Persian word *jāmah*, which meant “garment” or “robe”. Both Han Rulin and Thomas Allsen have drawn attention to the connection between the Mongol court and Persian words for textiles and clothing elements. We have discussed both *nasīj* and *zandanījī*, textiles with Arabic and Persian-derived names, above. In the description of imperial dress in *Yuan shi juan* 78, additional Persian and Arabic-derived words are used to describe the emperor’s *zhisun/zhama* suits, including *yahu* (牙忽, Persian: *yāqūt*, hyacinth [stone]), *dana* (答納, Persian: *dāna*, pearl), and *sufu* (速夫, Arabic: *ṣūf*, wool). Han Rulin argues that these appellations reflect the Western or Central Asian origin of many of these products, and the people who produced and sold them. Ceremonial robing was part of a larger, Central Asian tradition, and many parts of Central Asia used Persian at least as an administrative language in the centuries prior to Mongol rule, but there is no evidence for direct transmission of the particular *zhisun/jisün/zhama* ceremony from Central Asia. Rather, the size and scale of this type of banquet was probably a Mongol innovation.


478 Han Rulin, “Yuandai zhama yan xin tan,” 251.
Understanding the appellation “zhisun” or “zhama” of these suits as an indicator of the circumstances in which they were worn – as gifts to high officials from the khan, for special courtly events, rather than specifying a particular cut of robe – explains the seeming lacuna of archaeological or pictorial evidence for these suits. I believe they were likely a variation of a bianxian, or some related, fitted, riding coat, made from nasij, silk, or other luxury materials and paired with a matching hat and belt.479

While zhama banquets originated with Chinggis Khan,480 they gradually became more elaborate and systematic, as descriptions of these events from Khubilai’s reign convey. Khubilai and his advisers adopted the scale and spectacular aspect of the Song dynasty imperial ceremonies and processions, while emphasizing the tradition of honorific feasting and robing so central to groups from the Steppe and Central Asia, thereby retaining important cultural aspects of the tradition while giving it the magnificence necessary to the Mongol Empire.

Robing at the Chinese court was distinct in two ways from Central Asian and Mongol traditions. First, dress in the Chinese court was highly regulated by rank, which we recall was not a feature of Mongol court dress until the fourteenth century. Second, the ceremonial aspect of the act of robing was absent from the Chinese court. At the Northern Song court, for example, while a distinction between “official” and “court”

479 James Watt hypothesizes, “it would seem that the difference between an ordinary nasij robe and the more formal zhisun wear was the addition of pearls and previous stones.” WSWG, 138.
480 The origins of the jisün/zhisun banquets are discussed in Chapter 1, 19 and Chapter 2, 120-121.
dress was mandated, the actual gifting of robes seems to have been less important than
the use of such robes to outwardly express the hierarchy of the court officials.\textsuperscript{481}

During Northern Song court ceremonies, especially those including processions,
officials would gather according to rank, wearing robes of a specific color, as we see
depicted in such paintings as the \textit{Illustration of the Imperial Guard of Honor (Lubu tu 鹵簿圖)} in the collection of the National Museum of History in Beijing from 1053 (fig. 3.37).\textsuperscript{482} The \textit{Yuan shi} tells us that the parade of the Imperial Guard of Honor, which
would accompany the emperor to sacrifice at the Imperial Ancestor Temple, depicted in
this Song dynasty painting, was reinstated during the reign of Yingzong (Gegeen Khan,
aka Shidebala, r. 1320-1323).\textsuperscript{483} The visual effect of this parade may have been co-opted
earlier, however, during the reign of Khubilai Khan, for his \textit{zhisun} ceremonies. The
spectacle of thousands of officials in robes of various colors was undoubtedly impressive,
and perhaps has a connection to the monochromatic element of the \textit{jisün} robes – while
the individual robes were monochrome, the variety of colored silks used would have
made the overall effect highly polychromatic. Such an effect must simply have been
increased in the Mongol period with the use of gold thread on \textit{jisün} robes.

\textsuperscript{482} Ebrey, “Taking Out the Grand Carriage,” 41-42 and note 18.
\textsuperscript{483} \textit{YS juan} 78, 1929.
Conclusion

Court dress in the Yuan dynasty was systematized under Khubilai Khan. This systematization did not take the form of clothing regulations or specific tailoring, but involved the large scale production and gifting of specific materials from the emperor to his court. This central act of gifting, and its ceremonial aspect, were retained from earlier tradition; they simply happened on a majestic scale. In order to robe thousands of officials for various occasions the offices in charge of production had to produce an enormous quantity of material. The Yuan period was also a time of intense cultural exchange with the West. This will be the central consideration of the next chapter, in which we will attempt to understand what constituted the Ilkhanid vestimentary system, and how this may have been impacted by interaction with the Yuan.
Chapter 4: Ilkhanid Court Dress (1259-1353)

The Mongol Empire in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries spanned the Asian continent. It is thus essential, in our quest to define the form and function of Mongol court dress in China to compare Yuan textiles and costume with those worn on the Western end of the Mongol Empire, in the Ilkhanate (fig. 4.1).

We recall that after the death of Chinggis Khan in 1227 the territories he had conquered in the Steppe region were split into *ulus*, or appanages among his four sons by his principle wife: Ögödei, who succeed Chinggis as Supreme Khan; Jochi (c. 1181-1226/7); Chaghatai (c. 1183-1242); and Tolui (c.1192-1332). By the 1250s, four principle khanates emerged (although many of the smaller *ulus* remained), differing from the four *ulus* granted to Chinggis’ sons: the supreme khanate in China, the Ilkhanate in Persia, the Golden Horde in the Steppe region, and the Chagatai khanate in Central Asia. Technically, the three other khanates were subordinate to the supreme khanate in China, which under Khubilai Khan became the Yuan dynasty in 1271. It appears, however, that the only khanate that ever truly adhered to this arrangement was the Ilkhanate (the name “Ilkhanate” means “subordinate khanate”). I favor evidence from the Ilkhanate as the main foil to the Yuan material over the other khanates because the cultural connection between the Yuan and Ilkhanid courts is documented; relations

---

485 Peter Jackson introduces the complexities of the relations between the various Mongol territories in Jackson, “From *Ulus* to Khanate,” 12-38.
between the Yuan and the other khanates and *ulus* were more fractured.\footnote{Thomas Allsen’s book, *Culture and Conquest in Mongol Eurasia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001) illuminates the relationship between the Yuan and Ilkhan courts. Bolad Aqa (or Bulad Zhengxiang), a Mongol official who served both in the Yuan administration and as an adviser to Rashid al-Din played an especially important role in this relationship (see Allsen, *Culture and Conquest*, parts 3 and 4, 59-82).} In addition, more material and textual evidence regarding artistic production and dress survives from the Ilkhanate than from other territories.

Hülegü (1165-1217), the third son of Chinggis’ son Tolui, was charged with the leadership of the Mongols’ western campaigns by his brother, the Great Khan Möngke, in 1253. Hülegü defeated the ‘Abbasid caliph in Baghdad in 1258 and continued westward, conquering (and causing massive destruction in) most of the territory of present-day Iraq, Iran, the territory south of the Caucasuses, and Anatolia.\footnote{Reuven Amitai, “Northern Syria between the Mongols and Mamluks: Political Boundary, Military Frontier, and Ethnic Affinities,” in Reuven Amitai (ed.), *The Mongols in the Islamic Lands: Studies in the History of the Ilkhanate* (Variorum Collected Studies Series, Aldershot and Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 1997), 128.} Hülegü may have continued his westward expansion, had his armies not been defeated by the Mamluks at the battle of ‘Ayn Jalut in Northern Palestine in 1260.\footnote{Amitai, “Northern Syria,” 128.} 1260 also marked the year that Khubilai, who had declared himself Great Khan after the death of Möngke, granted Hülegü the title of Ilkhan.\footnote{Jackson, “From *Ulus* to Khanate,” 29.} As was the case with Khubilai in China, Hülegü found himself ruler over large populations of sedentary peoples and was faced with the necessity of establishing a courtly vocabulary that would assert Mongol political power and legitimacy over the inhabitants of this area. We find similarities between the form and use of dress in the courts of the Yuan and the Ilkhanate, especially in the role played by textiles and robes at
ceremonial banquets. However, the situation in West Asia endowed such ceremonies with different semantic significances.

**Scholarship**

Few studies have focused specifically on Ilkhanid dress and textiles. However, in recent years a combination of comprehensive studies on Mongol art and history and several articles on Mongol textiles have created a solid basis for scholarship in the field. As with the previous chapters, Allsen’s *Commodity and Exchange in the Mongol Empire* includes valuable information about Mongol exchange and West Asian textiles despite including neither images nor analysis of actual objects.\(^{491}\) Exhibition catalogues, such as *When Silk Was Gold* and *The Legacy of Genghis Khan*, dedicate some study to textile production and use in West Asia, and exchange between the Mongol khanates.\(^{492}\) Anne Wardwell’s study, “*Panni Tartarici*: Eastern Islamic Silks Woven with Gold and Silver (13\(^{\text{th}}\) and 14\(^{\text{th}}\) Centuries),” endeavors to categorize different types of Mongol Period silks from West and Central Asia based on weave structure and the makeup of the threads.\(^{493}\) Wardwell’s work remains a basis for studies of the material. Both *The Legacy of Genghis Khan* and its follow-up volume from 2006, *Beyond the Legacy of Genghis Khan*, succeed in addressing cultural aspects of the different geographic sections of the Mongol world.\(^{494}\)


\(^{493}\) Anne E. Wardwell, "*Panni Tartarici*: Eastern Islamic Silks Woven with Gold and Silver (13\(^{\text{th}}\) and 14\(^{\text{th}}\) Centuries)", *Islamic Art* 3 (1989) 95-173.

\(^{494}\) Linda Komaroff, ed., *Beyond the Legacy of Genghis Khan* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2006).
However, the Mongol khanates are generally approached not in relation to one another, but rather as separate entities. In addition, in many essays in the two catalogues “influence” continues to be attributed to “China” and “Iran,” erasing Mongol agency.

In the last ten years, scholars such as Yuka Kadoi and Ladan Akbarnia have broadly studied the exchange between West and East Asia under the Mongols, devoting some of their scholarship to dress and textiles.\textsuperscript{495} “Khita’i: Cultural Memory and the Creation of a Mongol Visual Idiom in Iran and Central Asia” by Ladan Akbarnia (2007) and \textit{Islamic Chinoiserie: The Art of Mongol Iran} by Yuka Kadoi (2009), based on a dissertation of 2005, tackle the question of Mongol cultural agency. Both works examine the fascination with and co-opting of Chinese motifs in the art and architecture of the Ilkhanate. \textit{Islamic Chinoiserie} brings together much of the material produced under the Ilkhans including illuminated manuscripts, metalwork, ceramics, and textiles. Kadoi emphasizes that while exchange certainly existed between the Iranian world and China prior to the Mongol period, Ilkhanid art stands out from the artistic tradition of Persia through its conscious incorporation of Chinese motifs and themes. Kadoi expands on these themes in several articles.\textsuperscript{496} Akbarnia’s “Khita’i” takes the topic a step further by situating artistic material and its cultural significance in the larger context of the Mongol Empire in Eurasia. In addition, Akbarnia is acutely aware of the problem of Mongol

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}
agency, and her analysis of the artwork produced under the Ilkhans is effective in addressing this and other issues that arise when attempting a systematic approach to Mongol art.

Also useful for this study are works by Islamic textile historians and Islamic historians interested in material culture that aid in setting the stage for the area conquered by the Ilkhanate. The most important book for the study of Islamic textiles is Yedida K. Stillman’s *Arab Dress* (2000), a text-based study supplemented where possible with archaeological evidence. R.B. Serjeant’s *Islamic Textiles: Material for a History up to the Mongol Conquest* (1972) examines textual evidence for the production of ṭirāz and other royal textiles. Phyllis Ackerman’s “Textiles of the Islamic Periods: A History,” in Alexander Pope’s monumental *Survey of Persian Art* (1938-1939), attempts to categorize types of dress by pattern, weave, material, and tailoring. In this she is somewhat thwarted by the lack of material that was securely attributed to the early periods (including the Ilkhanate) at the time she was writing, and relies heavily on depictions of dress on ceramics and illuminated manuscripts. Herman Goetz’s study of Persian costume in the same volume is equally limited by the lack of material extant from the pre-Seljuk period in Persia. It also relies heavily on illuminated manuscript paintings and portrayals on ceramics. Despite these limitations, the studies by Goetz and
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Ackerman form the foundations of the field, and are still useful as a starting point in
studies of Islamic and Persian textiles and dress today.

David Talbot Rice and Basil Gray’s study of the illustrations in the Edinburgh
copy of the *Jamiʿ al-tawarikh, The Illustrations to the “World History” of Rashid al-Din*
(1973) focuses primarily on painted depictions of dress.\(^{501}\) In it, Rice and Gray look at the
costume, textile patterns, and ethnic types in a systematic way. This methodology has its
flaws and is sometimes reductive in its conclusions, but as the first investigation that
looks closely at the paintings and the costume depicted within them, it is a foundational
text in the study of Ilkhanid artistic production, including textiles and dress. In more
recent times, Sheila Blair’s work on dating and analyzing both the text and paintings of
the *Jamiʿ al-tawarikh, A Compendium of Chronicles: Rashid al-Din’s Illustrated History
of the World* (1995), has been invaluable.\(^{502}\)

**Period Texts**

A similar combination of primary sources to those used in the chapters on the pre-
Yuan and Yuan periods – official histories and travel accounts – provide the best
evidence for textiles and dress in the Ilkhanate. As in the last chapter, Marco Polo’s
*Devisement du Monde* is useful, and Ibn Battuta’s *Rihla* provides good descriptions of
West and Central Asia, although much of the information provided about dress is not

---

\(^{501}\) David Talbot Rice and Basil Gray, *The Illustrations to the “World History” of Rashid al-Din*

D. Khalili Collection of Islamic Art, 27 (London: Nour Foundation in association with Azimuth Editions
and Oxford University Press, 1995).
specific in terms of actual textiles used and fashions worn in particular regions. Another account containing information about the Mongol territories in the West is a narrative by Rabban Bar Sauma (c. 1220-1294), the Nestorian (follower of the Church of the East), which recounts his journey from Khubilai’s Dadu to Baghdad and, later, to Europe. Rashid al-Din’s *Jami‘ al-tawarikh* is especially useful in the Ilkhanid context as this was a work commissioned by the court, and in addition to its text, the illuminations in early fourteenth century copies provide us with evidence of how the Mongol Ilkhans wished to be portrayed.

Other historical chronicles by West Asians in the Mongol period include *Makhtebhanuth zabhne* (known in English as *The Chronological and Political History of the World*) by Bar Hebraeus (aka Gregorius Abu’l Farag, c. 1226-1286), another follower of the Church of the East. This presents a history of the world from Biblical Creation to the 1280s, including a history of the Ilkhans up until 1286, and is written in Syriac.

Both *Tarikh ‘al-Mukhtasar fi Akhbar al-Bashar* (*Concise History of Humanity*) by Abu’l-

---

503 For translations of Rashid al-Din and Juvayni see Chapter 2, 84, note 197. For translations of Marco Polo see Chapter 3, 132, note 334.

504 “Nestorian” is considered a term with negative connotations by scholars of Nestorians/Church of the East – Nestorius was considered a heretic by the Church due to his insistence on the dual nature of Christ – the preferred terminology is the “Church of the East.” The term “Nestorian” is however widespread, and so I will be using both to limit confusion. See Tjalling H.F. Halbertsma, *Early Christian Remains of Inner Mongolia: Discovery, Reconstruction and Appropriation* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2008), 3-4.


Fida’ (c. 1273-1331), and Ibn al-Dawadari’s (fl. 1309-1335) *Kanz al-durar wa-jami’ al-ghurar* (also known as the *Chronicle of ibn al-Dawadari*), while written by Mamluk historians, record some information about diplomatic exchanges between the Mamluks and Ilkhans that sheds light on gift exchange and the use of textiles by the two courts.\(^{508}\)

For a more complete picture of how dress in the Ilkhanate developed, it is also necessary to take into account dress worn in the ‘Abbasid court prior to the Mongol invasions. For this, records of court regulations such as Hilal al-Sabi’s *Rusum Dar al-Khilafa* (*The Rules and Regulations of the ‘Abbasid Court*) help us understand what the ‘Abbasid court was wearing prior to the Mongol invasion.\(^{509}\)

**Textiles**

There are markedly fewer textiles extant from West Asia than from East Asia that can be securely dated to the Mongol period. Fewer still are in the form of a robe or other type of vestment that may have been worn in the Ilkhanate. This is due principally to the difference in burial rituals between the Islamic lands on the one hand, and East and Central Asia, on the other. Many different groups in East and Central Asia had elaborate burial practices ensuring that the deceased would be interred not only in a fine suit of

---


Ibn al-Dawadari’s history has not been translated into a European language, although it was published (in Arabic) by a German publishing house under the title *Die Chronik des Ibn ad-Dawadari* (Weisbaden: Franz Steiner-Verlag GMBH, 1982). It will be referenced here in the context of secondary literature wherein it has been cited or quoted in translation.

clothes, but often accompanied by a variety of burial goods. It is thanks to such burial practices that material from Moskevaja Balka in Central Asia, and the Liao, and Jin, and Yuan dynasties in North China and its borders have been preserved, although the specificities of burial practice certainly differed in each case. The Mongol burial tradition also involved a quantity of burial goods, but the Mongols were buried in secret. John of Plano Carpini describes Mongol burials of the 1240s, noting that “less important men…[are] buried in secret in the open country,” with a dwelling, a table with food, and a mare and foal, riding tack, along with gold and silver.510 “Chief men,” according to Rubruck, were buried with all of the goods mentioned above, and also buried in secret, with the place completely concealed: “Then they fill the pit in front of his grave, an they put grass over it so that no one may be able to discover the spot afterwards.”511

The Islamic tradition, on the other hand, calls for the deceased to be buried in a simple shroud and placed directly in the ground.512 The Ilkhan Ghazan (r. 1295-1304) converted to Islam in 1295, but there is no evidence that elaborate burials were practiced under the previous Ilkhans. Therefore, the only places in which Ilkhanid textiles have survived are in European church treasuries and fourteenth-century European tombs. Some of the material included in the previous chapter (preserved in Tibetan monasteries or East Asian tombs) may have been produced in the Ilkhanate but this is difficult to determine.

511 Carpini in Dawson, 13.
512 James E. Lindsay, Daily Life in the Medieval Islamic World (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2005), 201.
Indeed, several European tombs contain Ilkhanid textiles. The tomb of Can Grande della Scala (d. 1329) contained textiles from the Ilkhanid period which are now preserved in the Museo di Castelvecchio in Verona. An Ilkhanid textile with a design of parrots from the tomb of Blanche of Portugal (d. 1321) is now preserved in Burgos, Spain in the Museo de Telas y Preseas at the Monasterio de las Huelgas. Also preserved in the same museum at the Monasterio de las Huelgas is a striped and inscribed textile from the tomb of Alfonso de la Cerda (d. 1333). The tomb of the early Hapsburg, Duke Rudolph IV of Austria (d. 1365) featured a burial robe for the duke with a ṭirāz of the Ilkan Abu Sa’īd, now preserved in the Erzbischöfliches Dom- und Diözesanmuseum in Vienna.

Churches which had preserved Ilkhanid textiles in their treasuries include the Marienkirche in Gdansk in Poland, and the Alte Kapelle in the cathedral of Regensburg, in Germany. A dalmatic associated with Pope Benedict XI (r. 1303-4) has been preserved in the Victoria and Albert Museum in London (Victoria and Albert Museum, no. 8288-1863), and several more in Regensburg. For the Regensburg collections see also Ritter “Kunst mit Botschaft,” 117-118.

514 Wardwell “Panni Tartarici,” 101 and fig. 12.
515 Wardwell “Panni Tartarici,” 97, 101 and fig. 13.
517 Marienkirche pieces are preserved in London (Victoria and Albert Museum, no. 783-1875) and Berlin (Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Kunstgewemuseum, no. 1875.259). See Ritter “Kunst mit Botschaft,” 118; Komaroff and Carboni, The Legacy of Genghis Khan cat. 75; Wardwell “Panni Tartarici,” 103, 106-107 and figs. 26, 41, 42. One piece from Regensburg is in the London (Victoria and Albert, no. 8288-1863), and several more in Regensburg. For the Regensburg collections see also Ritter “Kunst mit Botschaft,” 117-118.
preserved in San Domenico, Perugia, and a fragment from another ecclesiastical vestments (*paramentum*) is currently in the Metropolitan Museum of Art (19.191.3). Another dalmatic with a pattern of peacocks is in the Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum in Brunswick (Braunschweig), Germany (M174). “Tartar” silks are noted in a 1295 Vatican inventory of Boniface VIII; in a fourteenth century inventory from Riga, Latvia; in a 1341 inventory of the church of San Francesco at Assisi; and a 1311 inventory of Pope Clement V. In addition, fragments of textiles likely produced in the Ilkhanate have been preserved in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Cleveland Museum of Art, the Victoria and Albert Museum, the Berlin State Museums (Staatliche Museen zu Berlin), and the David Collection.

**Illuminated Manuscripts**

Court-commissioned illuminated manuscripts are one of the best sources for the Ilkhanid vestimentary system. Examples are a frontispiece from a copy of Juvayni’s *Tarikh-i jahan gusha (History of the World Conqueror)* from 1290,
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519 Wardwell “*Panni Tartarici,*” 101 and fig. 9.

520 For the 1295 inventory of Boniface VIII see Molinier, Emile. *Inventaire du trésor du Sain Siège sous Boniface VIII* (1295) (Paris, 1888); also cited in Arnold, 57-58; also cited in Wardwell “*Panni Tartarici,*” 139. For Riga see Tommaso Valenti, “*Gl’inventari di Fr. Frederico de Pernstein, O.M., arcivescovo di Riga* (1304-1341),” *Miscellanea franciscana XXXIII* (1933), 46-66; also cited in Arnold, 119 n. 2. For the 1341 inventory of San Francesco see Fratini, Giuseppe, *Storia della basilica e del convent di S. Francesco in Assisi* (Prato: Ranieri Guasti Editore-Libraio, 1882); also cited in Wardwell “*Panni Tartarici,*” 139. For the inventory of Pope Clement V: “…panno tartarico indico, laborato ad denarius de auro…” see Wardwell “*Panni Tartarici,*” 139.

521 The surviving illustrated edition of Juvayni’s *History of the World Conqueror* was copied by Rashid al-Khwâfî, likely in Baghdad, and finished in 1290 CE (AH 689). Ink, colors, and gold on paper. BNF Paris (MSS or., Suppl. persan 205) see Linda Komaroff, “The Transmission and Dissemination of a New Visual
Marzubannama (Book of the Margrave) of 1299, editions of the Jami' al-tawarikh (Compendium of Chronicles) from the early fourteenth century; editions of the Persian national epic, the Shahnama (Book of the Kings) from the fourteenth century; and some folios from Muhammad ibn Badr al-Din Jajarmi’s Mu’nis al-ahrar fi daqa’iq al-ash’ar (The Free Men’s Companion to the Subtleties of Poems). As we have seen in previous chapters, pictorial evidence does not provide perfect evidence of dress. Representations of dress do not tell us much about the materials used, or tailoring. In addition, we have no way of really knowing whether how the Ilkhans chose to be represented sartorially in such manuscripts reflects what Mongol rulers in West Asia, or their advisors, actually wore.

Representations of clothing in Ilkhanid illuminated manuscripts were highly conventionalized and different types of figures are easily identified by their dress. Many courtiers are dressed as Mongols and they wear outfits familiar to us from the Yuan dynasty and earlier in the thirteenth century. Others are dressed in the long robes and turbans of Islamic scholars. Several scholars have noted a lack of specificity in the painted scenes, especially in the Jami’ al-tawarikh – the same compositions repeat themselves to stand in for a variety of settings, and we are dependent on the text to
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523 There are other illustrated manuscripts dating from the Ilkhanid period, but not all of them show evidence for Ilkhanid dress. For a discussion of 13th-14th century Iranian illuminated manuscripts see Adamova, Mediaeval Persian Painting, 1-9.
understand the image. Nonetheless, these offer the best surviving evidence of Ilkhanid dress that survives. If the scenes do not give us explicit information about particular historical moments, they do an excellent job of illustrating an idealized Persian-Mongol view of court life, and especially of kingship. As with other paintings considered in this study, they give us important information about how the Ilkhanids wished to be represented.

**Jami‘ al-tawarikh**

The *Jami‘ al-tawarikh*, compiled under the direction of the Ilkhanid vizir, Rashid al-Din (c. 1247-1318) was originally written in three volumes which were eventually expanded to four (volumes 2 and 3 were originally one volume): (1) *Tarikh-i Ghazani*, the history of the Mongols; (2) the history of Öljeitü; (3) the history of the non-Mongol peoples of Eurasia; and (4) a world geography, which has not survived. Three illuminated examples, two in Persian and one in Arabic, remain from Rashid al-Din’s lifetime. These are believed to have been produced in the scriptorium attached to a charitable foundation established by Rashid al-Din, the Rab‘i-Rashidi (“Quarter of Rashid”), located north-east of Tabriz. In an addendum to a large endowment he left to the Rab‘i-Rashidi, Rashid al-Din stipulated that two copies of the *Jami‘ al-tawarikh*

---


should be produced every year, one in Arabic and one in Persian. This rapid pace of production may be one reason why the compositions of the paintings within it are so repetitive and generalizing.

The surviving Arabic version of the Jami' al-tawarikh is older than the Persian versions; it dates to 1306-1307 CE (AH 706). It is incomplete, with only half the original folios (which totaled approximately 400) preserved; these are divided between two collections, one in Edinburgh (Edinburgh University Library, Arab No. 20) from the collection of Colonel John Baillie, which includes 151 folios, and the other in the Khalili Collection (MSS 727) rediscovered in the collection of the Royal Asiatic Society in 1841 by William Morley and including 59 folios. Since the nineteenth century, scholars have debated whether or not the two parts came from the same manuscript; much confusion was caused by a discrepancy in the size of the folios, and the differing dates inscribed on each. In this, I follow Sheila Blair, who argues that the slight difference in size and marginalia between the Edinburgh and Khalili folios can be explained by later trimming and additions after production, and shows that the discrepancy in dates is caused by the addition of a later date on the Khalili Collection folios after the initial colophon was written.
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527 Blair, A Compendium of Chronicles, 13-14.
528 Blair, A Compendium of Chronicles, 68.
529 Sheila Blair has reconstructed the order of the surviving folios. See Blair, A Compendium of Chronicles, 23-27.
530 Blair Blair, A Compendium of Chronicles, 16-17.
531 Sheila Blair gives a thorough historiography of the dating and attribution of the manuscripts in Blair, A Compendium of Chronicles, 16-17.
532 Blair, A Compendium of Chronicles, 21.
The two Persian manuscripts are preserved in the Topkapı Saray Museum (H 1653 and H 1654). H 1653 features a combination of folios from the fourteenth and fifteenth century, including sections from c. 1314 (AH 714). Güner Inal has attributed the first 68 illustrations in H 1653 (up to folio 384) to the Ilkhanid period. H 1654 is a more complete copy of the text of the *Jami‘ al-tawarikh* from 1317 (AH 717). However, with the exception of the first three illuminations, all the paintings seem to have been added later. Inal argues, based on the renditions of certain enthronement scenes, that paintings from H 1654 were copied after the paintings in the Edinburgh Arabic manuscript.

**Shahnama**

The *Shahnama* (“Book of the Kings”), is considered the Persian national epic poem, and was finished by the poet Ferdowsi in 1010 CE. Illuminated versions of the text from the Ilkhanid period demonstrate an interest among the Mongols in aligning

---

themselves with the greater lineage of the Persian kings.\textsuperscript{539} In the Ilkhanid versions, the principle actors in the stories are presented as Mongol princes. Evidence survives for ten illustrated versions of the \textit{Shahnama} from the Ilkhanid period. These are (1) the Great Mongol (also called Demotte) \textit{Shahnama};\textsuperscript{540} (2) the “First” small \textit{Shahnama};\textsuperscript{541} (3) the “Second” small \textit{Shahnama};\textsuperscript{542} (4) the small \textit{Shahnama} in the Freer Gallery of Art;\textsuperscript{543} (5) the small \textit{Shahnama} in the Metropolitan Museum of Art (formerly Schulz or Gutman);\textsuperscript{544} (6) a \textit{Shahnama} from the National Library of Russia in St. Petersburg (Dorn 329) from 1333;\textsuperscript{545} (7) a \textit{Shahnama} on long-term loan to the Sackler Gallery, sometimes called the Stephens \textit{Shahnama}, from 1352;\textsuperscript{546} (8) H 1479 in the Topkapi from c. 1330;\textsuperscript{547} (9) a fragmentary manuscript in the J.K.R. Cama Oriental Institute, Bombay;\textsuperscript{548} (10) 15 illustrations from c. 1335 from the Diez Album in the Staatsbibliothek, Berlin.\textsuperscript{549}

\textsuperscript{539} Marianna Shreve Simpson, \textit{The Illustration of an Epic: The Earliest Shahnama Manuscripts} (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1979), 5. Charles Melville argues that it was not the Mongols, but their advisors who attempted to “embrace these traditions as part and parcel of their territorial conquest.” See Melville, “The Royal Image in Mongol Iran,” 348.


\textsuperscript{541} Simpson, “Shahnama as text and Shahnama as image,” 11.

\textsuperscript{542} Simpson, “Shahnama as text and Shahnama as image,” 11.

\textsuperscript{543} Simpson, “Shahnama as text and Shahnama as image,” 11.


\textsuperscript{545} Simpson, “Shahnama as text and Shahnama as image,” 11.

\textsuperscript{546} Simpson, “Shahnama as text and Shahnama as image,” 11.

\textsuperscript{547} Simpson, “Shahnama as text and Shahnama as image,” 11; Swietochowski and Carboni \textit{Illustrated Poetry and Epic Images}, 15.

\textsuperscript{548} Simpson, “Shahnama as text and Shahnama as image,” 11.

\textsuperscript{549} Swietochowski, “The Metropolitan Museum of Art’s Small Shahnama,” 68-70.
Mu‘nis al-ahrar fi daqa‘iq al-ash‘ar

A third source for painted representations of Ilkhanid dress is an illuminated copy of Muhammad ibn Badr al-Din’s Jajarmi’s Mu‘nis al-ahrar fi daqa‘iq al-ash‘ar (The Free Men’s Companion to the Subtleties of Poems), likely produced in Isfahan in 1341 (AH 741). This work is different from the Jami‘ al-tawarikh and the Shahnama for two major reasons. First it has a relatively small number of illustrations: there are only six (not counting the frontispiece) illustrated folios out of 257, and these are all in a single chapter, 29. Second, because of the close relationship between text and image – unlike the conventionalized and repetitious imagery of the Jami‘ al-tawarikh, the images here are essential to understanding the text. The six folios with illustrations are located in five institutions: one each in the Arthur M. Sackler Museum in Cambridge; the Cleveland Museum of Art; Princeton University Library; the Robert Garrett Collection; and two in the Metropolitan Museum of Art. The text of the manuscript itself is in the Dar al-Athar al-Islamiyya in Kuwait (LNS 9 MS), which includes a double frontispiece showing an enthronement scene and a hunting scene.

550 The most extensive study of the work’s illustrations and text is found in Stefano Carboni, “The Illustrations in the Mu‘nis al-ahrar” in Illustrated Poetry and Epic Images: Persian Painting of the 1330s and 1340s, Marie Lukens Swietochowski and Stefano Carboni (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1994), 9-48.
Textile Production Sites

Lampas, including nasīj, and other fine textiles such as silk samite, and velvet were produced within the Ilkhanate, but we have less information for determining where specific materials were produced for the court than for the Yuan dynasty. Most significantly, there is no evidence for a Yuan-like central government network of textile agencies in the Ilkhanate. Rather, it seems that the princely households of the Ilkhanate had weavers within them who may have produced material for their official use, supplemented by material from larger workshops.555 For example, we read in the Jamiʿ al-tawarikh that during a struggle for the throne between Tegüder Ahmad (r. 1281-84) and Arghun (r. 1284-91):

[Tegüder Ahmad’s troops] galloped as far as Varamin, seized and plundered three hundred households of artisans who belonged to Arghun Khan, and returned to the camp. When Arghun was apprised of this event he sent envoys to the treasury at Garrakan to bring everything that was available. He also sent to the workshops at Nishapur, Tus, and Isfarayin to have cloth brought. Within twenty days quantities of gold, jewels, and textiles were delivered to Adiliyya in Jurjan and he distributed it among the amirs and soldiers.556

The implication here is that Arghun had a quantity of artisans working for him, but also a series of workshops where he might have had cloth produced for his household’s use as well.

The dispatch of large diplomatic gifts including textiles sent from the Ilkhans to the Mamluk (1250-1517 CE) court in Egypt also indicates that there was some central court production of luxury textiles. There are many recorded instances of diplomatic gifting between the Ilkhans and the Mamluks, but two specific occasions stand out for the scale and magnificence of objects exchanged. A diplomatic gift from the Ilkhan Tegüder Ahmad which Bar Hebraeus describes as including “precious stones, and marvelous pearls, and gold, and silver, and apparel, and bales of stuffs (i.e. brocades) wherein much gold was woven,” from the royal treasury of the Mongols along with a “royal pattern” woven into textiles destined for gifting is one such example. Some decades later, in 1324, the Ilkhan Abu Sa’id (r. 1316-1335), sent ambassadors with an abundance of precious gifts to the Mamluk sultan Nasir al-Din Muhammad ibn Qala’un (r. 1293-94/693;1299-1308/698-708; and 1310-1341/709-741CE). Abu’l-Fida' records that the Mamluk sultan received (in addition to other gifts): “a number of choice gowns of cloth and so forth, all with sleeve-bands of gold brocade, a piece of muslin containing a number of pieces of gold brocade, and eleven decorated Bactrian camels carrying chests full of cloth, the produce of that country, numbering 700 pieces inscribed with the sultan’s titles.” Such large-scale and specific production certainly indicates a central organization of court weavers; in addition, the 700 pieces are referred to as “the produce

---

557 For an overview of Ilkhan-Mamluk diplomatic relations, see Donald Little, “Diplomatic Missions and Gifts Exchanged by Mamluks and Ilkhans,” in Komaroff, Beyond the Legacy of Genghis Khan, 30-42.
559 Abu’l-Fida', The Memoirs of a Syrian Prince, 84. Also mentioned in Von Folsach “A Set of Silk Panels from the Mongol Period,” 234.
560 Abu’l-Fida', The Memoirs of a Syrian Prince, 84.
of that country.” Such gifts also tie into the practice of gifting ṭirāz, which will be discussed in greater detail below.

Prior to the Mongol invasions, the textile producing centers of the ‘Abbasid court were centered in Baghdad, but Kufa and Basra were also major producers of silks and other fine materials; these locations also had ṭirāz factories. Baghdad was heavily damaged by the Mongol conquest. However, its ṭirāz factory appears to have been revived under the Mongols, with the vizier Taj al-Din ‘Ali Shah appointed to oversee it by the Ilkhan Öljaytu (r.1304-1316) in 712 AH (1312-1313 CE). Another ṭirāz factory was established under ‘Ali Shah’s direction at the Ilkhanid summer capital of Sultaniya. Other locations that flourished under the Ilkhans were largely in areas in present-day Iran and Afghanistan, including Kerman, in present-day Iran, which was a center for textile production and trade.

By considering what remained of the textile producing traditions of the region after the Mongol conquests, alongside descriptions from contemporary texts, we may hypothesize where textiles were being woven for the court, and by whom. Several textile production and trade centers within the Ilkhanate are described by Marco Polo and Ibn Battuta. Marco Polo describes different types of fabric produced in Tabriz, Yazd, and Kerman. He notes of Tabriz: “It is true that the men of Tauris [Tabriz] live by trade and crafts, for there are made there many cloths with gold and of silk and of great value.”
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561 Serjeant, Islamic Textiles, 16; 27-31; 32-38.
562 Serjeant, Islamic Textiles, 25-27.
563 Serjeant, Islamic Textiles, 25-27.
564 Serjeant, Islamic Textiles, 107-108.
565 Marco Polo, 104.
The textile production of Yazd, too, is described in trade terms: “Iasd [Yazd] is in Persie itself, a very good city and noble, and of great trade. Many cloths of silk which are called Iasdi [Yazdi] are made, which the merchants carry them to many parts to make their profit.” Kerman is noted for its embroidery: “And the ladies and damsels work very nobly with the needle in beasts and in birds and in many other likenesses on cloth of silk of all colors.” Ibn Battuta, writing a generation after Polo, notes that “kamkhā […] are silken fabrics manufactured in Baghdad, Tabriz, Naisabur, and in China.”

The Persian term kamkhā, known in European texts from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, beginning with John of Mandeville, as “camaca” or “camoca,” seems to have signified a lampas weave textile woven with metal, related to nasīj. The word in Persian, with cognates in Greek, Turkish, and Arabic comes from the Minnan Chinese language (spoken in Fujian, among other places) kimhoe, “golden flower” (Mandarin Chinese: jinhua 金花). The distinction made in period texts, including Ibn Battuta, between camaca and nasīj indicates that they were two different fabrics, but what exactly differentiated them is a matter of speculation.

Reading Marco Polo’s descriptions above, in each of the cities noted as a textile production center the description of the textiles produced is interwoven with the city’s
role as a trade center. This might be because Marco Polo was a merchant himself, and
likely paid more attention to this aspect of city life. Geographically, the textile industry of
Tabriz was best situated for producing large orders for the Mongol court, as Tabriz was
an Ilkhanid capital. Polo’s reference to “cloths with gold and silk,” paired with Ibn
Battuta’s comment that kamkhā was produced there, fits with what we know of the types
of textiles preferred by the Mongols in China – silk and with over-all gold patterns
(nasīj). Without further evidence for specific courtly production we can only speculate,
but it is possible that the Ilkhanid court was supplied by some combination of weavers
dedicated to princely households, with larger orders of material to be used in gifting
provided from the centers at Tabriz, Baghdad, and Sultaniya, possibly supplemented by
textiles from Yazd and Kerman.

Alongside textiles produced within the Ilkhanate for the court, textiles from the
Yuan territories and elsewhere were also imported to the Ilkhanate, principally through
maritime and overland trade routes, but also through courtly exchange.571 Hormuz
(“Curmos” in Marco Polo), for example, was an important sea port, and a center for the
importing of textiles, rather than their production. As Marco Polo describes, “and I tell
you that the merchants come there from Indie with their ships, bringing there all spiceries
and precious stones and pearls and cloth of silk and gold and elephant tusks and many
other wares, and in that city they sell them to the other men who then carry them through

571 Komaroff and Carboni, The Legacy of Genghis Khan, 172; Thomas Allsen, “A Cultural Broker in the
Court of the Il-khans,” in Raby, Julian and Teresa Fitzherbert (eds.), The Court of the Ilkhans (Oxford:
all the whole world, selling to the other peoples.”\textsuperscript{572} Marco Polo’s Hormuz refers to what we now call “Old” Hormuz, which was situated across from the present-day island of Hormuz, and was a center for international exchange between Persia and the East in the tenth through fourteenth centuries.\textsuperscript{573} According to Marco Polo it was part of the “kingdom of Cherman [Kerman],” and it is corroborated in Persian sources that Hormuz was a vassal state to Kerman.\textsuperscript{574} Hormuz was an important entry point for diplomatic missions between the Yuan and the Ilkhanate, especially when the overland routes were inaccessible due to war with the Chaghadaids.

**Textile Types and Patterns**

As mentioned above, scholars of Ilkhanid textiles and dress generally base their research on depictions from contemporary illuminated manuscripts.\textsuperscript{575} While these paintings are an important source of evidence for how the Mongol khans wished to be portrayed, they cannot stand in for the actual object. Starting from the painting and working out is a neat way of conducting research – we are able to define clear sartorial typologies and categories of patterns within a limited body of work. However, as we have seen with the dress of other peoples surveyed in previous chapters, matching the represented to the actual object can be difficult. Extrapolating from a small corpus of

\textsuperscript{572} Marco Polo, 123.

\textsuperscript{573} Marco Polo describes arriving at Curmos: “And when one has ridden for two days journeys he finds the Ocean sea; and on the shore is a city which is called Curmos, which has a harbor.” Marco Polo, 123.


paintings to court dress more generally is a big leap. Here, we do our best to strike a
balance between extant textiles datable to the Ilkhanid period and portrayals of textiles
and types of dress in manuscript paintings in order to highlight the gaps between these
two forms of evidence. While recognizing some of the problems painted depictions of
dress pose, we will begin with the paintings in order to define clothing types familiar to
us from the Yuan dynasty, before moving on to surviving textiles, to highlight similarities
and differences between the two courts. The limited quantity of textiles available pose
their own challenges – the evidence that has survived has done so because of fourteenth
century royal and clerical tastes in Europe. Surviving as they did in ecclesiastical and
royal treasuries, the textiles associated with the Ilkhanate are generally lampas weave
with gilded threads, in other words, types of nasīj (or kamkhā). Therefore, the emphasis
in this section is on pattern types, with notes about weave structure where relevant.

Xiongbei and Yujian

The most frequently depicted dress in the Khalili/Edinburgh Jami‘ al-tawarikh, and also often portrayed in various editions of the Shahnama is a short sleeved over-robe
over a long-sleeved under-robe, often embellished with a xiongbei (“Mandarin square”) familiar to us from the Yuan dynasty. Paired with trousers, boots, and a hat, this style of
dress is generally used as shorthand for Mongol figures. No extant examples of xiongbei have survived in Europe, perhaps because xiongbei were not gifted to foreign polities. In
this case, thanks to surviving examples from Mongol-period China, we may hypothesize
with some certainty that they were worn in the Ilkhanate. In the Ilkhanid context, as in the
Yuan, they appear to have been a status symbol within the Mongol court. Their use in the *Shahnama*, for example, is consistently restricted to the central kingly or heroic figure, or in some cases his entourage.

We see this for example, on the figure of Iskandar (Alexander the Great) from the Ilkhanid-era Sackler *Shahnama* (fig. 4.2). In a scene of Iskandar building a rampart to keep the local population safe from frequent attacks of the barbarian inhabitants of Gog and Magog, Iskander is represented as a Mongol khan. Seated on his horse, he wears a dark-blue short-sleeved over-robe over a long-sleeved under-robe; an Ilkhanid-style crown sits upon his head. The blue over-robe shows a geometric design in gold around the arms, in the place of ṭirāz in other representations. On the chest is a floral design in gold. In another section of the same *Shahnama*, the portrayal of the founder of the Sasanian dynasty (224-651 CE), Ardashir (r. 224-241 CE), wears a nearly identical costume to Iskandar (fig. 4.3), down to the color of the robes, and the floral pattern on his chest. In a third instance in the same manuscript, showing a composite scene of first Taynush (the son of Qaydafa, queen of Andalus) before Iskandar and, second, Iskandar’s visit to the Brahmans, Iskandar is represented twice, both times wearing a xiongbei robe (fig. 4.4). Seated under a tree on the right side of the composition, Iskander wears a white, short-sleeved, over-robe over a red, long-sleeved, under-robe patterned with small gold repeats. The xiongbei on his chest, also in gold, is more schematized than in the other two examples but suggests a floral motif. The figure standing to Iskandar’s right
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(the viewer’s left), likely representing Taynush, also wears a *xiongbei* robe. As the figure stands in three-quarter profile, we see both the front and back of the robe, which shows a central badge, schematized in similar fashion to Iskandar’s badge. The equestrian figure in red to the left of the composition, another representation of Iskandar, has his back to us, also showing us his *xiongbei*. The insistence of representing these badges on the centrally important figures, and the detail of the badge on the front and back of the robe, increases the likelihood that the manuscript painters were recreating an image of Mongol courtly attire.

Members of the royal entourage wear *xiongbei* in the same manuscript, for example, in the folio showing Afrasiyab (the Turanian king, enemy of the Persians) taking Siyavush (son of the Persian king Kay Kavus) captive (fig. 4.5). Here two figures flanking Siyavush wear long-sleeved robes with gold central badges. The one to the left of the composition has a blue robe with a gold pattern band that decorates the skirt of his robe below the knee, while his associate wears a dark green robe with schematized representations of a tear-drop motif in gold, as well as a central gold badge on his chest. Afrasiyab, astride a horse and cast in the role of the leader in this scene lacks a *xiongbei*, but the archer behind him has a *xiongbei* on his blue robe as well. So, while we cannot say that the *xiongbei* in Ilkhanid illuminated manuscripts was a symbol of the khan, it clearly had some role as a marker of a court official, someone of status who, if not at the level of the khan, was in his entourage.

Another element of Ilkhanid dress likely imported from the Yuan court is the *yujian*, or “cloud collar” pattern. This pattern was briefly introduced in Chapter 2. In the
Ilkhanid period, we find it decorating the robes of figures in illuminated manuscripts, such as a kneeling figure in a painting of the enthronement of Shah Zav from the *Shahnama* (fig. 4.6). In terms of surviving textiles, the only remnant that may have come originally from the Ilkhanate is a chasuble from the Marienkirche in lampas weave with brocaded patterns in purple silk and gold thread (fig. 4.7). In contrast to the Jin and Yuan dynasty cloud collars, and the cloud collars depicted on figures in the *Shahnama*, on the chasuble the cloud collar is used not as a collar, but as a central motif creating a cross on the purple silk. This derivation may simply indicate that the cloud collar was being used more frequently as a pattern than as an actual collar, or that the original Ilkhanid material was repurposed in Europe for a Christian use. By the fourteenth century, the cloud collar motif had spread to a variety of media, including ceramic decoration, and textile panels (meant to decorate the interior of a building or tent). Representations such as that of Shah Zav from the *Shahnama*, however, show that the original use of the cloud collar was not lost in its westward transmission.

**Repeat Patterns**

The extant textiles from the Ilkhanid period show a preference for dense, naturalistic patterning, often featuring animals and floral motifs. The animals on many of the surviving textiles from this period show a hybridization that may indicate that they were woven in Central Asia rather than in the Ilkhanate. In contrast to the geometric or
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578 Wardwell “*Panni Tartarici,*” 103-104 and fig. 26.
579 Wardwell, “*Panni Tartarici,*” 100-101.
small cloud-shaped patterning on some Yuan textiles, the background pattern on surviving Ilkhanid textiles often takes the form of a floral scroll. The first type of pattern we will consider is a repeat pattern, possibly related to the *jin duanzi* repeat patterns of palmettes or animals in teardrop shapes produced in the Jin and Yuan dynasties, or Seljuk patterns of animal friezes. There are two examples of this in the Victoria and Albert Museum: a dalmatic Featuring stags and pelicans in alternating rows, separated by tufts of flowers (8361-1863) (fig. 4.7) and a chasuble of a similar, but not identical pattern (594-1884) (fig. 4.8). The dalmatic is lampas weave, with a blue silk satin weave background and gold threads made by wrapping a gilded lamella around a linen core in an s-twist, and the chasuble appears to have the same technical characteristics. There has been some confusion about the place of manufacture of these textiles, and objects like them, showing as they do a combination of Chinese, Central Asian, West Asian, and Italian elements. Anne Wardwell has proposed that these objects, and others like them, were woven in Western Persia, due to the use of the linen core for metallic threads, among other clues. Wardwell also points out that a *panno tartaresco*, “tartar cloth” described as having a design of pelicans is included in a 1341 inventory of San Francesco in Assisi, which seems to bolster the evidence that these pieces were made in the Ilkhanate rather than in Italy.
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580 The Victoria and Albert online record states that the technique is “silk embroidered with silk and metal thread,” but my observations (from April 22 and 24, 2014) are that it is a lampas weave. See http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O93246/dalmatic-unknown/ Accessed December 2, 2015. My observations are corroborated by Anne Wardwell’s analysis, see Wardwell “Panni Tartarici,” 112-113.


582 Wardwell, “Panni Tartarici,” 115.

583 Wardwell, “Panni Tartarici,” 114.
This type of repeat pattern with alternating rows of animals interspersed with floral motifs, while perhaps having some rapport with the repeat patterns in a gold supplementary weft on tabby weave silk (jin duanzi) we saw in Jin and Yuan textiles is nonetheless quite distinct. A repeat pattern often illustrated in the H. 1653 Jami‘ al-tawarikh (fig. 4.9) appears to be more related to jin duanzi than the type of all-over animal and floral motifs described on the Victoria and Albert dalmatic and chasuble. In H. 1653 the pattern of small, tear-drop shaped repeats may be shorthand for jin duanzi, so popular at the Eastern end of the Mongol Empire, but the pictorial representation here is too schematized for us to make a definite connection. A more detailed rendition of what may be a similar pattern is in the Sackler Shahnama (fig. 4.5). In this painting, discussed above in the context of xiongbei robes, the attendant figure to the right of the prisoner wears a dark green, long-sleeved robe, adorned with a xiongbei and a repeat pattern of teardrop shapes. In this instance, the teardrops are approximately the size that they would be if the material was indeed a form of jin duanzi (we recall examples such as figs. 2.2, 2.6, 2.7, among others, from Chapter 2). In addition, Afrasiyab astride a horse wears what looks to be a pattern of repeat palmettes in gold with a background of floral or geometric shapes, in the same style as the Mongol robe in the David Collection that we studied in the context of the bianxian in Chapter 2 (fig. 2.43). Although these patterns are schematized, they are nonetheless specific enough to hypothesize that the artists responsible were giving the royal viewer a type of shorthand for patterns with which they were familiar.
No examples of the tabby or twill weave silks with gold supplementary weft repeat patterns (*jin duanzi*) are extant in European collections, which does not necessarily mean they were not worn in the Ilkhanate. They may have been imported for court use from the Yuan rather than being produced in the Ilkhanate for domestic and international gifting and trade, therefore their absence in European collections is not surprising. Another hypothesis is that the small teardrop shaped repeats depicted in H. 1653 may represent an entirely different type of textile: red velvets with a pattern of gold disks. Examples of such velvets are preserved in the Cleveland Museum of Art (fig. 4.10), the Cooper Hewitt National Design Museum (fig. 4.11), and the Royal Museum of Art and History in Brussels (fig. 4.12), among other collections.\(^{584}\) Red-colored “tartar” textiles with patterns of gold disks are also described in several European treasuries: the 1295 Vatican inventory of Pope Boniface VIII, the 1311 inventory of Pope Clement V, and the 1341 inventory of San Francesco in Assisi.\(^{585}\) However, only two of these mention the words “red velvet,” inventory number 1165 in the 1295 inventory (*pilosum rubeum*) and the inventory of San Francesco (*rosso velluto*), and while inventory number 1165

---


describes the pattern on the velvet as “gold discs” (*medalías aureas*), the pattern on the San Francesco red velvet (which is, in addition to being a velvet also described as a samite, “sciamito”) is of gold birds (*uccelli d’oro*).

The question of Ilkhanid velvets is a complex one; many scholars have attributed these velvets to Italy or Spain, while others have argued for a Persian origin. Among those who attribute the velvets to Persia, there is no consensus on where and when they were produced, although the thirteenth or fourteenth century (the Ilkhanid period) is the general timeframe given. The remaining velvets are all red, with offset rows of gold discs punctuating the pile of the velvet. While visually similar, they have been shown to have been woven on different looms in a weave analysis by Milton Sonday. Anne Wardwell hypothesizes, based on the similarity of these velvets, which are lampas weave, to the lampas structure of the Abu Sa’id ṭirāz, discussed in further detail below, that they were woven in Tabriz. The representations of the small teardrop-shaped gold repeats in H. 1653 are quite schematic and may not refer to this type of material, but the fact that velvets were likely produced in the Ilkhanate, with apparent popularity in princely collections in Europe, broadens our view of the variety of textiles worn and used in the Mongol Iran.

Another Ilkhanid-Mongol pattern related to the animal and floral repeats discussed above is a loose composition of animals and floral motifs giving the design a
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586 See Sonday, note 2, 144 for a list of articles that give Italian and Spanish provenance to the velvets. Anne Wardwell “Panni Tartarici,” argues that they are from Persia, and while Milton Sonday does not give firm evidence for a Persian origin, seems to agree with Wardwell’s arguments, see Sonday, 143.
587 Sonday, 103-104.
588 Wardwell “Panni Tartarici,” 111.
naturalistic feel, as seen in a series of pieces preserved in the Abegg-Stiftung (fig. 4.13).

This pattern was not only likely worn in the Ilkhanate, but was also imitated in fourteenth century Italy. The pattern is a repeat, and therefore is as regular as the textiles with the orderly rows of pelicans, goats, and floral patterns studied earlier, but the feel is less constrained and less symmetrical, with the birds flying upwards and the more naturalistic flowers and branches forming a loose background pattern. Other fragments of the same textile are preserved in Berlin, Budapest, Esztergom (Hungary), Cologne, and Krefeld (Germany). The fragments are lampas weave with polychrome silk threads and a supplementary weft of gold lamella on animal substrate wrapped in an s-twist around a linen core, a similar type of lampas weave and materials to those found on the dalmatic and chasuble with the pelicans in the Victoria and Albert Museum (figs. 4.7, 4.8). This type of asymmetrical patterning was imitated by silk weavers in fourteenth-century Lucca. As with the pelican textiles, these type of meandering scroll patterns bring together a variety of motifs, from China, Central Asia, West Asia, and Italy.

While no surviving textiles from the Yuan show animals on a background of meandering floral and branches, we do find related patterns on Yuan blue and white ceramics (fig. 4.14). As with most of the patterns discussed in the context of the Mongol period, this pattern, and others related to it, such as a simple vine pattern without animals, an example of which will be seen below demonstrate the transference of motifs between
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591 This type of textile is analyzed and discussed in Wardwell “Panni Tartarici,” 113.
East and West over the centuries. In this instance, the particular textile pattern was likely derived from an eastern prototype, as seen in Yuan blue and white ceramics, which in turn was probably incorporated prior Chinese or Central Asian scroll patterns from textiles, ceramics, and metalwork.\textsuperscript{592}

Scrolling vines without birds or animals, also appear to have been widespread in the Ilkhanid period, and were likewise imitated in fourteenth century Lucca. One example is in the Victoria and Albert Museum (fig. 4.15), a red silk lampas woven textile with gilt and silvered lamellas. Another fragment that appears to be from the same cloth is in the Kunstgewerbemuseum in Berlin (fig. 4.16) The floral patterns, and the clouds or fungi on the vines, have a clear connection to Chinese prototypes. From a Chinese perspective the floral shape looks like a lotus bud with a flame around it, although if this fragment survived in a church in Europe, it may have been interpreted as a pomegranate (symbol of the Passion of Christ) or a pinecone.

**Tiny Repeat Floral Patterns in Gold**

A type of *nasīj* that does not seem to have existed in East Asia in the Mongol period, but was relatively widespread in elite circles in the Ilkhanate and Italy in the 13\textsuperscript{th} and 14\textsuperscript{th} centuries features an all-over pattern of tiny leaves and floral motifs. Examples include the dalmatic said to have belonged to Benedict XI (fig. 4.17), a fragment from the Metropolitan Museum of Art (fig. 4.18), and a fragment in the Cleveland Museum of Art.

\textsuperscript{592} Scrolling vine patterns existed in China and Central Asia prior to the Yuan dynasty, but as was the case with other patterns, evidence that we have for the spread of the scrolling vine in textile form dates from the Mongol period, the 13\textsuperscript{th} - 14\textsuperscript{th} centuries.
(fig. 4.19). Wearing such a textile would have given the effect of being completely covered in gold. The exact pattern, hard to discern even when looking at a fragment up close, was probably less important than the over-all gilded effect. A pictorial depiction of this type of cloth may be found in the Sackler Shahnama, on the figure of Afrasiyab (fig. 4.20). At first glance, the robe appears to be monochrome, but upon closer observation, we find there is a tiny repeat pattern on the surface, creating a monochrome gold appearance. The spread of this pattern to Europe, especially to Northern Italy in the 14th century, will be discussed in the Conclusion.

**Stripes and Tirāz**

A pattern specific to West Asia that continued in the Mongol period is multicolored horizontal or vertical stripes. Pictorial evidence prior to the Mongol conquests is found in both schematized representations on mina’i ware (fig. 4.21) and in manuscript paintings (fig. 4.22). The mode for stripes, especially stripes with inscriptions woven into them, survived into the Mongol period, but it is unclear how frequently striped garments were actually worn by the Ilkhan and his court as they are infrequently (if at all) depicted on Mongol figures in manuscript paintings. The figure of Ardavan in the scene *Ardashir captures Ardavan* from the Sackler Gallery *Shahnama* wears a striped robe (fig. 4.3), for example.
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Several examples from the Ilkhanid period that may have been used as robes have survived in European tombs and churches. While related in pattern, they represent three different technical varieties of inscribed striped textiles, as we will see. They include: (1) a textile with stripes and inscriptions from the tomb of Alfonso de la Cerda (d. 1333) now in Burgos (fig. 4.23). (2) Textile “A,” nearly identical to the one from Burgos, from the tomb of Cangrande della Scala (d. 1329), now in Verona (fig. 4.24). (3) Three fragments of a silk and gold woven robe in the tomb of Rudolph IV (d. 1365) now in Vienna inscribed with the name of the Ilkhanid ruler Abu Sa’id (fig. 2.41). (4) Several fragments from the same or related piece originally from Marienkirche in Gdansk: (a) a striped textile with an Arabic inscription from fourteenth century Iran now in the Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Preussicher Kulterbesitz, Kunstgewerbemuseum (1875.259) (fig. 4.25); (b) a fragment now in the Victoria and Albert Museum, and also inscribed with Arabic text (783-1875) (fig. 4.26); (c) Two pieces preserved in Lübeck (M-111 and M-32) (figs. 4.27, 4.28). (5) Several fragments of a dalmatic from Regensburg inscribed with Arabic text, preserved in Regensburg (fig. 4.29), and in the Victoria and Albert Museum (fig. 4.30).

The striped textiles from the tombs of Alfonso de la Cerda and Cangrande della Scala, likely based on the same pattern, are lampas woven silk textiles with gold thread made of a gilded lamella on an animal substrate. Both have large inscriptions woven in gold lampas that are meant to read *al-malik al-ashraf al-a’lā*, “the most noble and
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594 Wardwell “*Panni Tartarici,*” 97.
supreme king.” According to Harold Glidden, both inscriptions had spelling errors, likely caused by the transmission of this inscription from a Mamluk prototype to a weaver under the Ilkhanate who was unfamiliar with Arabic. The fragments from Regensburg are also woven of silk and gold thread made of a gilded lamella on animal substrate lampas. They are inscribed with the line *al-ʾizz wal-naṣr wal-iqbāl*, “glory and victory and prosperity.”

Related to these in terms of pattern, but contrasting in weave, are textiles preserved from the Marienkirche of Gdansk. These are woven of a lampas made from silk and metallic threads, but here, in contrast to the above examples, the metallic threads are made of gilded or silvered strips on animal substrate wound around a cotton core. The Victoria and Albert fragment (783-1875) and the Berlin fragments (1875.259) have identical inscriptions and very similar bands of patterning featuring, alongside an animal frieze, a motif of Chinese-style lotuses. The colors in photographic reproductions of the pieces are dissimilar but it appears they came from the same fragment in the Marienkirche of Gdansk. Two other related pieces, preserved as a dalmatic (M-111) and a chasuble (M-32) in Lübeck, also feature similar patterns and inscriptions, although the slight differences in some of the decorative scheme of the stripes make it unlikely they were from the same piece as the Victoria and Albert and Berlin fragments. The
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595 Wardwell “Panni Tartarici,” 100.
596 Wardwell “Panni Tartarici,” 100.
597 Wardwell “Panni Tartarici,” 100.
inscription on all of these fragments reads *al-sulṭān al-ʿālim* “the learned Sultan,” a Mamluk phrase that may indicate these were made for a Mamluk, rather than an Ilkhanid context. As with the previous textiles, there is a spelling mistake: the *sin* (س) of “sultan” is missing in both inscriptions.

The inscription with the titles of Abu-Saʿid contrasts with the other examples, as this inscription mentions a specific Ilkhanid ruler: “Glory to our lord the most great sultan, the exalted monarch ʿAla al-Dunya wa-al-Din [A]bu Saʿid Bahadur Khan, may God make his rule to be eternal.” In addition, while we can date the two fragments recovered from tombs to sometime before the deaths of the tomb occupants (1333 and 1329, respectively), the titles on the *ṭīrāz* of Abu-Saʿid date decades prior to the death of Rudoph IV, leading scholars to date the fragment to a sixteen year period between 1319 and 1335. Anne Wardwell hypothesizes on the basis of technical characteristics and the fineness of the weave that it was woven in a royal *ṭīrāz* factory in Tabriz.

That all of our examples are inscribed with text (woven with a supplementary weft) in gold connects stripes more generally to *ṭīrāz*. *Ṭīrāz* was introduced in Chapter 2. We recall that it was first made under the ʿAbbasid (c. 758-1258) and Fatimid (c. 909-1171) caliphs during the 9th-13th centuries. The term *ṭīrāz* originally comes from the Persian “to embroider,” *ṭarāzidan*, but it soon came to refer to garments more generally.

---

600 Wardwell “*Panni Tartarici,*” 107.
601 Thanks to Elias Saba.
602 Wardwell “*Panni Tartarici,*” 108.
603 For analysis of the Abu-Saʿid textile see Ritter “Kunst mit Botschaft,” 105-135. See also Wardwell “*Panni Tartarici,*” 108-109.
604 Wardwell “*Panni Tartarici,*” 111.
Ṭirāz bands originally contained the names and titles of the caliph or local ruler, later incorporating auspicious words or phrases. Sometimes script had a more decorative function – pseudo-inscriptions are found on both ‘Abbasid and Fatimid textiles beginning in the 12th century.605 Due to their role as gifts from the caliph to favored officials, ṭirāz bands imparted a certain status on the wearer and implied wealth and power.606 The transference of meaning from actual ṭirāz inscriptions to pseudo-inscriptions resembling ṭirāz bands both in style and placement on robes which retained their original significance as status symbol is in many ways logical. That is, the look of ṭirāz bands, and their placement on robes, was so recognizable and laden with significance that even illegible variations of it conveyed status.

Most ṭirāz bands on textiles from the ‘Abbasid and Fatimid courts were embroidered onto cotton or linen, sometimes using silk or gold threads for the inscriptions (fig. 4.31). These inscriptions generally used some variation of the Kufic script, characterized by regular, monumental, angular letters.607 Woven inscriptions in samite (weft-faced compound twill) were also produced, using silk threads and woven on a drawloom. Such woven inscribed textiles were not commonly produced in West Persian
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605 Pseudo-Kufic or Kufesque scripts also existed on ‘Abbasid and Fatimid textiles in the 12th century, see Blair, *Islamic Inscriptions*, 167.
607 Sheila Blair defines Kūfī/Kufic as “literally, from Kufa, a garrison city in southern Iraq founded in 638 CE and one of the intellectual centers in early Islamic times; a general term used to refer to the angular scripts used for early copies of the Koran.” See Sheila Blair, *Islamic Calligraphy* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006), xxi.
workshops until the tenth century, however, after the weaving technique of samite was conveyed from Central to West Asia.

As we recall from Chapter 2, in addition to the Abu Sa’id textile, Kjeld von Folsach ascribes two more ṭirāz to the Mongol period, based on the fact that these inscriptions mention specific rulers: one in the David Collection in Copenhagen inscribed with the name of Abu Bakr, ruler of Fars (r. 1226-1260) (fig. 2.40); and a silk and gold ṭirāz woven with the name of the Mamluk sultan Nasir al-Din Muhammad ibn Qala’un in Lübeck (fig. 2.42). The inscription on the Abu Bakr textile runs across the top, in the same fashion as CMA 1990.2 and David Collection 14/1992 (figs. 2.1, 2.3), which we looked at in the context of their inscriptions in Chapter 2. Indeed, these examples stand apart from the striped style of textile as they were likely made as hanging panels for the walls of tents, rather than for wearing on a robe. The Abu Sa’id ṭirāz on the other hand has been designed so that the inscribed bands would fall vertically down the robe. This placement is quite different from the Mongol-era robes with pseudo-inscriptions from Central Asia described earlier in this study, which as we recall ran from the neck down the shoulders and part of the arm of the robes (figs. 2.34-2.36). Although all variations of ṭirāz, none of the Central Asian robes has striped patterns – the strip of text or pseudo-text is cartouche-like, set on a background of repeat roundels or geometric patterns. This
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609 For a translation of the Abu Bakr ṭirāz see WSWG, 135. Kjeld von Folsach argues that these three textiles are the only surviving ones from the Ilkhanid period with legible inscriptions, see Folsach, “A Set of Silk Panels from the Mongol Period,” 233-237.
may highlight a difference between Central and East Asian Mongol use of ṭirāz and West Asian use of ṭirāz and stripes.

In contrast to our surviving examples, ṭirāz in manuscript paintings is represented on arm bands, and is found on a variety of patterned textiles, including those with stripes. There are few instances in which striped textiles are depicted in the Mongol period. One example is from the Khalili Jamiʿ al-tawarikh worn by one of Muhammad’s attendants in the scene The Prophet Muhammad receiving the submission of the Banu’l-Nadir (folio 72a of the reconstructed manuscript) (fig. 4.32).610 All of the represented figures have ṭirāz bands depicted on their upper arms. Another noticeably striped robe is seen in a representation of Mahmūd of Ghazna donning a robe from the Caliph al-Qahir, 389/999, in the Jamiʿ al-tawarikh from Edinburgh (ie. From the same original manuscript as the Khalili edition) (fig. 4.33). Lisa Golombek has urged a distinction be made in the pre-Mongol period between ṭirāz textiles generally and khilʿa, robes of honor, pointing out that the remaining ṭirāz are generally made of linen and cotton, while khilʿa were described as silk, woven with gold, and other fine materials.611 However, in the Mongol context, it appears that striped robes were woven with inscriptions, were made of silk and gold, and were likely given as khilʿa, which may be one explanation how they ended up in Europe in the first place.

610 Blair, A Compendium of Chronicles, 71-72.
Plaid

Plaid is a distinct pattern, evidence of which appears to have only survived in illuminated manuscripts, where they are frequently enough depicted that we hypothesize it must have been worn in the Ilkhanate. The history of plaid weaves is ancient, and evidence of woolen plaids, woven in twill, exists from at least c. 1200 BCE in both Europe and Central Asia.\(^\text{612}\) Preserved in the salt mines at Hallstadt and the site of Loulan in the Taklamakan desert, the technology for weaving twilled plaids may have originated with Indo-European people on the Steppe and spread both eastward and westward by the end of the second millennium BCE.\(^\text{613}\) Plaids remained popular in West Asia and Western Europe into the first millennium CE, although there is no evidence for their production in East Asia until the early modern period. Their appearance in Ilkhanid manuscripts is rarely, if at all, seen on the figures dressed as Mongols, but rather reserved for scenes with important Islamic figures, such as those from the life of the Prophet Muhammad in the Edinburgh *Jami‘* al-tawarih (fig. 4.32). Attendant figures, wearing the robes in the style of Islamic scholars in the scene of Mahmūd of Ghazna putting on his khil‘a also wear checked textiles (fig. 4.33). Based on the lack of plaid in Yuan China and the lack of representations of Mongol-dressed figures wearing plaid in Ilkhanid manuscripts, I hypothesize that this was a local cloth, and not representative of Mongol taste.


\(^{613}\) Barber, *The Mummies of Ürümchi*, 132-145.
Ilkhanid Dress

Dress in West Asia was quite diverse prior to the Mongol invasion. By the Umayyad Caliphate (661-750 CE), borrowing from Sasanian and Byzantine imperial culture, the Caliph and members of the court had adopted fitted outer coats and trousers, a contrast to the Arab style of an untailored robe. 614 Non-Arab dress was not universally accepted or implemented in this early period, and attempts were made at distinguishing Muslims and non-Muslims by their dress in the eighth and ninth centuries. 615 However, as parts of Central Asia were conquered, elements of Persian dress such as the fitted khaftān and trousers worn under it, were assimilated into the broader vestimentary system of the Umayads. 616 With the ‘Abbasids, such elements were fully integrated, and worn by people of varying social classes, not just by the court. 617 The official color of ‘Abbasid court dress was black, in contrast to the patterns favored by the Sasanians and the Byzantines, that is, large repeat patterns featuring pearl roundels containing zoomorphic motifs inside of them. 618 The ‘Abbasids also systematized the bestowal of robes of honor (khil‘a) as an integral part of investiture, and as a show of royal favor. 619 The role of dress for the Fatimids was perhaps even more central. The government had a special department that oversaw the production of dress for members of the court, and ritualized

616 Stillman, *Arab Dress*, 40; Goetz, 2237.
617 Stillman, *Arab Dress*, 42.
618 Stillman, *Arab Dress*, 42, 47-48; Goetz, 2237-2238; Hilāl al-Sābi’, 77.
not only gifting from the caliph to his court, but also the choosing of the caliph’s wardrobe each season.\footnote{Stillman, Arab Dress, 53-54.}

Dress prior to the Mongol conquest of West Asia, in other words, was both cosmopolitan and highly regulated. Gifting of clothing, and government production of court dress, were central aspects of the ‘Abbasid system. Central Asian-style fitted coats and trousers had been adopted for several centuries at the ‘Abbasid court. This general style of dress, and the importance of robing, are familiar to us from Mongol customs, especially in the Yuan. So did the form or function of dress change in any substantial way after the Mongol conquest of West Asia?

The clearest contributions from the Mongols were in the specific types of fitted coats worn, and the patterns introduced from China for textiles, at least according to manuscript illustrations. In particular, short sleeved over-robcs, worn over long-sleeved under-robcs, worn over trousers, and paired with boots and specific hats, is the dress that typically designates Mongol figures in Ilkhanid manuscript paintings, as we noted above (figs. 4.2-4.4). As for patterns, xiongbei robes, “cloud collar” (yujian) patterns, Central or East-Asian style dragons and phoenixes, and certain types of scrolling floral motifs, especially any featuring a lotus or a chrysanthemum, are examples of patterns introduced in the Mongol period.

Another type of apparently pan-Mongol dress is the coat or robe with underarm openings. In the Ilkhanid context, these appear to be restricted to royal use. In the Sackler Shahnama, for example, Shah Zav wears such a coat on half of his body (fig. 4.34). His
right arm is put through the underarm opening, with the coat draped over his right shoulder. We find the same style of coat on Iskander at the talking tree (fig. 4.35). Here, however, Iskander, astride his horse, wears the coat on both of his arms, which pass through the underarm openings, leaving the sleeves dangling along the side.

These representations are quite different from representations in Yuan paintings, discussed in the previous chapter. We recall that in Liu Guandao’s *Khubilai Khan Hunting* none of the figures wearing robes with underarm openings puts his arm through this opening, opting instead to wear the sleeves on his arms. In addition, in terms of surviving robes in the Yuan context, we recall that there was a button placed in the middle of the back of the robe from the Rossi and Rossi collection in London which may have attached the sleeves in the back, had the wearer decided to put his arms through the underarm openings (fig. 3.14). The manner of wearing these robes in the Ilkhanid context, then, may be connected to the types of robes found at Antinoopolis in Egypt, also discussed in the previous chapter, where the overly long and overly thin arms were not meant to be worn, but rather, dangled down the side of the body. Perhaps the Yuan robes with underarm openings, which I hypothesized were transmitted to East Asia via Central Asia in the Mongol period, and the Ilkhanid robes with underarm openings connect to distinct traditions in Central Asia and West Asia, respectively. Appreciated by the Mongols on either side of the Asian continent, the traditions may have been related, but used in distinct ways at each court.
Robing and Khil‘a

The Ilkhanate continued the ‘Abbasid tradition of khil‘a bestowals, but with the addition of variations seen in the Yuan dynasty such as mass robing for special feasts, and specific types of investiture robing. Khil‘a were introduced in the context of tīrāz above, but some historical explanation should be given before moving on to the role played by ceremonial robing under the Ilkhanids. The practice of gifting clothing was integral to the court ceremonies of honorific robing in the Islamic world from at least the 9th century. Although no pictorial evidence of honorific robing exists prior to the 13th century in the Islamic world, examples of such robing are found in both pre-Islamic Sasanian and early Islamic texts. In the Islamic world a central aspect of such bestowal was the gifting of khil‘a, which was highly regulated according to position and status.

The granting of khil‘a was a significant part of investiture ceremonies in the ‘Abbasid caliphate (c. 750-1258), and continued under the Mamluk sultanate. Bestowing khil‘a in the ‘Abbasid period marked the granting of titles and appointments to certain government positions, and khil‘a were often given as diplomatic gifts. There is very little specific information from period texts about the ceremony surrounding the gifting of
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622 Sasanian monarchs would bestow their own clothing on members of their court twice a year. See Anthony Cutler, “The emperor’s old clothes: actual and visual vesting and the transmission of power in Byzantium and Islam,” in Image Making in Byzantium, Sasanian Persia and the Early Muslim World (Farnham (UK) and Burlington (VT): Ashgate, Variorum, 2009), 203.
623 The earliest legendary example of the bestowal of khil‘a in Islamic history is the gift of the mantel (burda) of the Prophet Mohammed (d. 632) to a poet. See Baker, “Islamic Honorific Garments,” 25.
624 Dominique Sourdel, Robes of Honor in ‘Abbasid Baghdad During the Eighth to Eleventh Centuries,” in Robes and Honor, 139. See also Gavin R.G. Hambly, “From Baghdad to Bukara, From Ghazana to Dehli: The Khil ‘a Ceremony in the Transmission of Kingly Pomp and Circumstance,” in Robes and Honor, 194.
khil’a under the ‘Abbasids, although we know the designs and materials of robes that were conferred. Under the Mamluks, khil’a were often granted to different classes of high government officials, and the materials and used were highly regulated. Mamluk khil’a came in a variety of different forms; khil’a could refer to a simple cloak or robe, or an entire suit of clothes, including belts of different sorts and hats (as was the case with Mongol jisün/zhisun/zhama).

A pictorial scene of honorific robing from the Ilkhanid period shows Mahmud of Ghazna putting on a robe gifted to him from the Samanid caliph in 999 CE, discussed above in the context of tirāz and stripes (fig. 4.33). Mahmud is dressed as a Mongol prince and is donning a red and gold striped robe with overlong sleeves. This version of khil’a created by Persian artisans under Mongol patronage could indicate that, as with the Mongol attire, the artisan responsible for this picture was depicting a conventionalized version of khil’a from the Mongol period. The striped style of khil’a was certainly a variation used in by the fourteenth century Mamluks, as we read in Ibn Fadl Allah al-‘Umari’s (1301-1349) history, Masalik al-absar fi mamalik al-amsar:

Among robes of honor…there is one called tardwahsh produced in the tirāz factories of Alexandria, as well as in Cairo and Damascus. The tardwahsh was formed of several bands, some of different colors mixed with gilt qasab. Between these bands, were embroideries. These bands were woven in a gold material (qasab). If the person grew in rank, then a tirāz-band made of gold brocade, was

---

625 Hilal al-Sabi, Rusūm Dar al-Khilafa, 77.
627 Mayer, Mamluk Costume, 57.
appliqued on to the material and (the coat) was covered by grey squirrel or by beaver, as mentioned before.\textsuperscript{628}

Given that the Mamluks and the Ilkhans exchanged large quantities of textile stuffs, and that art historians of thirteenth and fourteenth century West Asia occasionally disagree on the origins of certain textiles, with some attributing a piece to the Ilkhanate and others to the Mamluks,\textsuperscript{629} it is not out of the question that there might have been overlap in the designs for Ilkhanid and Mamluk khil’a.

Contemporary descriptions of lavish gifting by the Mongol khans give evidence that in the Mongol period the gifting of textiles, while retaining the political significance it had in both the Mongol (Central Asian) tradition and the local Islamic tradition, was strongly connected to banqueting and feasting, as was the case with the jisūn/zhisun/zhama banquets in the Yuan. In the \textit{Jami‘ al-tawarikh}, Rashid al-Din describes a banquet hosted by Ghazan Khan (r. 1295-1304):

He ordered countless gold and textiles brought, and after the people were fed with all sorts of victuals he gave all the gold and textiles away in alms with his own hand so that all received a portion. For three days and nights the Koran was recited, and every group performed its religious duties after its own fashion. On the banquet day he placed on his head a jeweled crown, the likes of which had never before been seen, bound himself with an appropriate belt, and clad himself in expensive gold-brocaded garments. The ladies and princes, amirs and courtiers

\textsuperscript{628} Quoted in Mayer, \textit{Mamluk Costume}, 59.
\textsuperscript{629} Komaroff and Carboni, \textit{The Legacy of Genghis Khan}, 207.
were commanded to bedeck themselves with their finery, and all mounted
matchless horses and paraded around.\textsuperscript{630}

The Ilkhans spared no expense when it came to the ceremonies surrounding feasting, and,
like their Yuan counterparts, seem to have favored gold textiles above all for court use.

\textbf{Conclusion}

Clothing worn at the courts of the Yuan and the Ilkhanate had overlapping
aspects, especially in terms of specific motifs and types of distinctive dress. The \textit{xiongbei}
central badge motif, and the short sleeved, side closing cinched riding coat worn over a
long-sleeved under-robe in particular seems to have been a pan-Mongol innovation.
There also seems to have been a marked decrease during the Mongol period in
regulations pertaining to clothing as compared to the prior Song and ‘Abbasid dynasties.
Robing, too, was an integral part of the political and cultural theatre of each court. Both
courts also took on specific characteristics of the places they had conquered. We saw that
in the Yuan dynasty clothing production sites for the court were highly regulated, in the
Chinese bureaucratic fashion, and indeed the Chinese Confucian bureaucracy grew in
importance generally in the 14\textsuperscript{th} century. With Ghazan Khan’s conversion to Islam in
1295, the conventions and rituals befitting an Islamic state became more pronounced in
the Ilkhanate. This has impacted the study of textiles and dress most evidently in the fact
that Islamic burial rituals proscribed the burial of the body with grave goods, such as
textiles, resulting in a lack of evidence from the Ilkhanate. While the courts differed in

substantial ways, the Mongol rulers brought a type of cultural hybridity to both ends of Asia in the 13th and 14th centuries, something that has been highlighted in this comparative study.
Conclusion

In this study of the dress in the Mongol Empire, textiles, paintings, and texts were brought together in a comprehensive and systematic way for the first time, in order to make a sense of the evolving form and function of costume under the Mongols from the beginning of the thirteenth century to the middle of the fourteenth century. By taking into consideration the dress of groups that preceded the Mongols, including the Uighurs, Khitan, Jurchen, Tanguts, and Chinese, I have provided historical context to Mongol cultural innovations and costume especially in the East Asian cultural sphere. Dividing the study of Mongol dress into pre-imperial (1206-1260), Yuan (1260-1368), and Ilkhanid (1259-1353) showed how the materials and ceremonial use of dress originated and transformed as the Mongols became rulers over China and Persia. Tracing the common thread of gifting as a central ceremonial act and contract between the khan and his officials highlights the way that this act took different forms in different parts of Asia under the Mongols. Much of what has been laid out in this dissertation could form the groundwork for further studies of the use of clothing in various rituals during the Mongol period, broader aesthetic questions about the Mongol period, and the lasting impact of the Mongol Empire in Asia and Europe.

The thirteenth and fourteenth centuries marked a turning point in intercultural relations in the pre-modern world. For the first time, individuals traveled from one end of Eurasia to the other; in no prior century had cultures been brought into contact through war, trade, and diplomacy with such immediacy. What resulted from this far-reaching
cultural exchange was innovation in visual culture and the spread of forms, media, and technology favored by the Mongols. This is reflected especially in textiles, but also found in other media, e.g. blue and white porcelain, and manuscript painting. The fall of the Yuan dynasty in 1368 to Ming forces and the demise of the Ilkhanate in 1353 did not mark a distinct endpoint for Mongol cultural impact in China and Persia. Rather, we see across Asia that cultural innovations from the Mongol century had a lasting effect. The cultural reverberations of Mongol rule in China, Central Asia, and Persia, however, have not been fully studied. Further afield, Mongol culture also made a lasting impression on certain European centers, which we see echoed in the arts of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Here, some of the effects of Mongol culture across Asia and Europe will be introduced and considered, and avenues for future research will be suggested.

The Legacy of Mongol Dress and Culture

Ming China

At first glance, the cultural divide between the Yuan and the Ming (1368-1644) dynasties seems stark, especially regarding dress. Certainly the Ming did away with nasîj and the large zhisun-style ceremonies that had been such a central part of Yuan court culture. Nonetheless, the Ming inherited a number of systems from the Yuan which were consciously retained, as Henry Serruys has shown. The adoption of the xiongbei as Mandarin square, indicating rank in official dress, was the most obvious incorporation of

Yuan Mongol dress into the official dress of the Ming. Yuan dress had further reach than the Mandarin square, however. Most relevant in regard to this study is the prohibition against wearing Mongol-style dress in the first century-and-a-half of Ming rule. This occurs several times in the reign of Zhu Yuanzhang 朱元璋 (Hongwu 洪武 r. 1368-1398), the first Ming emperor, in 1367, 1368, 1372, and 1391 according to the Ming shilu 明實錄 (the “Veritable Records of the Ming”).632 Zhu Yuanzhang’s efforts were not successful: the Ming shilu notes that prohibitions were passed against “barbarian” dress again in 1443 and once more in 1491.633 What exactly constituted “barbarian dress” is ambiguous—while the Ming shilu specifies types of dress and hairstyle such as trousers, “bald sleeves” and braids, we do not know specifically if the styles worn were from the Yuan, or some adaptation of Yuan dress. It appears that even in an official capacity, the lack of concern among the subject population for showing rank via color or pattern in the Yuan dynasty continued into the Ming as well. A report recorded in the Ming shilu complains of military officials stationed on the border of Chinese and Mongol controlled territories wearing colors and designs outside of those allowed by their rank.634 A study on the reach and depth of Mongol culture in the Ming period would certainly yield a considerable amount of information that would enrich our understanding of the first half of the Ming dynasty.

633 Serruys, “Remains of Mongol Customs,” 161, 166.
634 Serruys, “Remains of Mongol Customs,” 163.
Timurid Central Asia and Persia

The most important successor state of the Mongols in Persia and Central Asia was the Timurid Empire (1370-1507). The founder of the Timurids, Timur (Tamerlane, r. 1370-1405), depended on the aura of legitimacy granted to him by his claims to be a successor of Chinggis Khan and his empire.\(^{635}\) Timur consciously continued a number of Chinggisid Mongol traditions, notably keeping in place the Chinggisid legal system and marrying his sons to Mongol noblewomen from the Chaghatayid royal house, that is the Chaghatai Khanate.\(^{636}\) In the artistic production of the Timurid Empire, court-commissioned artworks make clear this connection to the Chinggisid Mongols. Illuminated manuscripts reference Ilkhanid manuscripts, and we see that in many works, especially in the first century of Timurid rule, that members of the court are still portrayed as Mongols. For example, in a copy of the *Kalila u Dimna* of Nizamuddin from Herat and finished in 1429, we see familiar costume, short sleeved over-robcs over long-sleeved under-robcs, centralized *xiongbei* designs in gold, and conical hats, all of a kind with those portrayed in Ilkhanid manuscripts (fig. 5.1). Finding out what the Timurids were wearing, where they got their cloth, and how they used textiles and robing politically, would be a welcome addition to our knowledge of the artistic production of the Timurids and the broader visual culture of Central Asia and Persia in the 14\(^{th}\) and 15\(^{th}\) centuries.

---


13\textsuperscript{th} and 14\textsuperscript{th} Century Europe

Another legacy of Mongol culture, and especially textiles, is found removed from Mongol seats of power in Asia. Evidence of the impact of the Mongols on the \textit{imaginaire} of cities in Western Europe, especially those in Northern Italy and France, can be found in paintings and illuminated manuscripts dating to the Mongol period and the century following the decline of Mongol power in China and Persia. The European legacy is no surprise, dependent as we are on European sources for information about the Mongols, both in terms of actual preservation of material in church treasuries and tombs (especially for the Ilkhanate) and descriptions in accounts of missionaries such as William of Rubruck and John of Plano Carpini, and of course Marco Polo’s more colorful \textit{Devisement du Monde}. In Chapter 4 we touched on the difficulty in differentiating Italian and Spanish silks from those woven in the Ilkhanate or Central Asia due to the popularity of certain hybrid motifs and types of weaves in the fourteenth century across Asia and Europe, including lampas weave \textit{nasīj}, which we recall was described in thirteenth and fourteenth century inventories as \textit{camaca} and \textit{panno tartarico} (plural \textit{panni tartarici}). In addition to the production of such silks based on Central Asian and Persian prototypes in textile centers such as Lucca in the fourteenth century, another intriguing piece of evidence for the impact of Mongol silks in Northern Italy at the beginning of the Renaissance is in painting.
Mongols and Textiles in Northern Italian Painting

One of the most remarkable aspects of the painting from the second half of the thirteenth century (duecento) and first half of the fourteenth century (trecento) in Italy is the presence of Eastern, and specifically Mongol, elements. I refer to both the inclusion of textiles woven with gold resembling those woven in the Mongol controlled lands of Persia, Central Asia, and China, as well as “Mongol” figures in religious scenes. The Florentine artist Giotto (c.1266/67-1337), for example, included depictions of what appear to be Mongol figures in the scene of St. Peter’s crucifixion in the Stefaneschi Altarpiece (fig. 5.2). He also used something resembling ‘Phags-pa script to decorate the borders of textiles in several of his paintings, including his Crucifixion of 1305 (fig. 5.3).637 This script was invented by the ‘Phags-pa lama (1235-1280), who was commissioned by Khubilai Khan to create a way of writing the Mongolian language.638 While, to my knowledge, the script on these borders is illegible, it does bear a resemblance to ‘Phags-pa, a language thought to be Tibetan based.639 Giotto was just one of many northern Italian artists to include Mongols and their textiles in his paintings. Other depictions of Central Asian or Mongol-looking figures are seen in Ambrogio Lorenzetti’s (c.1290-1348) The Martyrdom of the Franciscans (fig. 5.4), and in Florentine artist Giovanni del Biondo’s (act. c. 1356-1399) St. Sebastian (fig. 5.5).

639 For an illustration of the ‘Phags-pa script and discussion of its origins and use see Coblin, Handbook of ‘Phags-pa, 5-7.
In these depictions of “Mongols” the figures wear high, pointed hats. It is possible that these artists were able to see a Mongol envoy or merchant in the flesh, though unlikely that Giotto, Lorenzetti, or del Biondo were able to distinguish between Central Asians or Mongols, who were often grouped together under the general term “Tartars.” The generalized non-European look of these figures, namely slightly darker skin tone and eyes seeming to lack an epicanthic fold, but more importantly, their pointed hats, was sufficient for the Italian viewer of the fourteenth century to recognize any of these figures as a “Tartar,” without specifically identifying them as hailing from a particular country or region.

With that in mind, the specificity of The Martyrdom of the Franciscans is striking. The Martyrdom of the Franciscans has convincingly been identified by S. Maureen Burke as a martyrdom of six Franciscans that occurred in the Central Asian city of Almalik (Almalyq, Almaliq) around 1339. Almalik, an important stop on the “Silk Road,” fell under the jurisdiction of the Chagatai Khanate, the area ruled by Chinggis Khan’s second son, Chagatai (1183-c.1242), and was located in present-day Xinjiang Province between the Tian Shan (mountain range) and Ili River near present-day Khulja. This depiction of such a recent occurrence not only gives a later date (c. 1342)

---

640 For the importance of hats and depiction of Mongol hats in European paintings, see Allsen, Commodity and Exchange, 18.
to the frescoes than had been previously assigned (c. 1329), but also shows the Franciscan interest in commissioning works depicting contemporary international events involving their missionaries.

A contemporary martyrdom scene would not necessarily require such a detailed and accurate depiction of Mongols to convey the message desired by the Franciscans in Siena, that is, that members of their order were giving their lives for their faith in far-distant eastern lands. A comparison with Giotto’s fresco, *Saint Francis Before the Sultan* in the Bardi Chapel (fig. 5.6) illustrates this point. The overall composition of *The Martyrdom of the Franciscans* may have been influenced by this work, though there is a marked contrast between the vagueness of Giotto’s Sultan and his attendants and the specificity of Ambrogio’s Mongols. The turbans on the figures in Giotto’s work seem to function as the principle sign of their eastern “other-ness” while Ambrogio provides much greater detail physically and sartorially. Indeed, Ambrogio’s intention here seems to have been to specifically evoke Mongols through the facial characteristics, hats, and textiles of several of the central figures, including the Khan. For example, we find a fairly specific depiction of textiles on the Mongol figures. Since *nasī̄j* was the most prized of all Mongol textiles, and because gold was a favored material in late Medieval and early Renaissance painting to emphasize the value of the work, it is not surprising to see depictions of gold textiles in the *Martyrdom of the Franciscans*, although in fresco, in
contrast to altarpieces, no real gold leaf was used. The clearest example of this is in the hat of one of the Mongol spectators. Here, Ambrogio appears to be evoking the small vegetal pattern often found on Central Asian gold textiles popularly depicted in Sienese painting. An example of this is the robe of the Angel Gabriel in Simone Martini’s *Annunciation* (fig. 5.7). However, Ambrogio has schematized the pattern on the hat, evoking this type of textile without showing it in elaborate detail – perhaps the idea of the fabric was enough to indicate its foreign origin, much in the same way that we noted earlier that the pointed hat itself functioned as a sort of visual shorthand for Mongols. It is very likely that painters such as Giotto, Simone Martini, and Ambrogio Lorenzetti had access to actual Mongol textiles through their patrons. For example, Simone Martini frescoed the Basilica di San Francesco at Assisi, which we recall from the 1341 inventory discussed in Chapter 4, had substantial holdings of “Tartar cloths.” The depiction of Mongols in the *Martyrdom of the Franciscans* manifests the fascination and fear that the idea of Mongols held for Europeans, who were aware, thanks in great part to Franciscan missionaries, of the actual threat the Mongols posed to Europe.

The Mongols were viewed both as a source of fear and as men of fantasy, depending on the context. We recall that Marco Polo’s account of the Mongol world was exceptional in its tone of wonder rather than disgust at Mongol culture and customs.

---


646 This would have begun in the aftermath of the Mongol invasions of Poland and Hungary in 1242. For a discussion of contemporary European sources about these invasions see Hansgerd Göckenjan, “Enzestimmung und Entdeckergeist: Die Mongolen im Spiegel zeitgenössischer abendländischer Quellen,” in Claudius Müller, ed., *Dschingis Khan und seine Erben: das Weltreich der Mongolen* (München: Hirmer, 2005), 209-217.
However, in the Italian paintings that form the corpus of those portraying Mongols, the Mongols are rendered according to stereotypes, either playing a villainous role or as accomplices to some wicked action. Mongol-style textiles on the other hand are portrayed in a variety of contexts, often clothing important religious figures such as the Virgin and Child, or Saint Catherine of Alexandria. In other words, their luxury goods were objects of desire, and even of religious significance, while the Mongols themselves were regarded with a fair amount of reserve or even distaste.

**Mongols in European Manuscripts**

In addition to Italian paintings, portrayals of Mongol khans made occasional appearances in illuminated manuscripts commissioned by royal courts across Europe. Altarpieces and frescos were made with the idea of public consumption in mind, but illuminated manuscripts were objects of private use, and the presence of Mongols here shows an interest in the east by individuals. A page illustrating the vice of Gluttony from a fourteenth century Genoese manuscript treatise on the Vices (possibly dating to before 1324) (fig. 5.8) appears to be inspired by contemporary Ilkhanid illuminated manuscripts.

---


manuscripts of an enthronement scene such as those from the *Shahnama* (fig. 4.34). This composition was obviously a popular one in Ilkhanid art, replicated not only many times in manuscript illustration but also in textiles, such as a roundel from the David Collection (fig. 5.9). In the Ilkhanid examples we see the crowned khan enthroned in a position of “royal ease” with one knee up and the other tucked under or off to the side, a cup in his right hand, surrounded by varying numbers of attendants, performing a variety of activities. The Ilkhanid manuscripts are of a very high quality, which is to be expected, for they were court commissions. The Genoese manuscript is of a similarly high quality and uses similarly costly materials such as gold leaf and what appears to be lapis lazuli, although it was a private commission. The treatise on vices was apparently written by a member of the Genoese Cocharelli family, inspired by anecdotes transmitted from his grandfather, Pelegrino Cocharelli, for the instruction of his children.649

As in the paintings mentioned above, the Khan is hardly shown in a positive light, although at least here he is not partaking in the martyrdom of pious Catholics. The khan is shown as a despotic figure of eastern decadence, a trope that would become popular in European art centuries later.650 Nonetheless, both his dress, and that of his non-European attendants, is portrayed in highly accurate detail, and in a totally different style from the paintings discussed earlier. This is likely due to the fact that the artist of this manuscript was looking not at Mongol envoys or textiles imported from the Ilkhanate as models, but an actual Ilkhanid manuscript; we see this when we compare this illustration with the

649 Backhouse, 135 and Flower, 128.
650 Especially in 19th century French Orientalist painting. See Eugène Delacroix’s 1827 *Death of Sardanapalus*, for example.
Shahnama scenes. Though the khan does not wear a crown, his by now familiar pointed hat is quite similar to those worn by several of the khan’s attendants in the Shahnama examples. The two figures flanking the khan in the Genoese manuscript appear to be European, but are wearing the same style of fitted coat as the Mongol attendants. The pattern in the background of this scene is evocative of eastern textiles woven with gold that we know were both highly sought after by the elite and popularly represented in the paintings of northern Italy at this period, although to my knowledge the patterns are not imitative of a specific textile. This illustration seems to encompass the multifaceted view that northern Italians, especially, had of Mongols of this period – that they were in a sense to be distrusted or even feared for their barbarism (here manifested in their inability to control their appetites),\(^{651}\) while shown in the trappings of eastern luxury described by Marco Polo and seen in the gold-woven silks imported into Europe at this time. In other words, hardly a model of good behavior but easily an object of fantasy.

**Mongols in the European Imaginaire**

The question remains of how Mongol subjects, or as they were often referred to, “Tartars” were regarded by thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Europeans, and how they may have been differentiated, if at all, from other “Eastern” figures such as the
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\(^{651}\) A portrayal of Mongols as overindulging in food and alcohol conforms to the view of William of Rubruck’s description of Mongol banquets: “After the master has drunk, then the attendant cries out as before, and the instrument-player breaks off. Then they drink all round, the men and the women, and sometimes vie with each other in drinking in a really disgusting and gluttonous manner.” Dawson, *Mongol Mission*, 97.
“Saracen,” the pejorative term for Muslims used in Medieval Europe. The first part of the question has been addressed to a certain extent above. As to the second part of the question, surely this depended on the context, as we saw with the contrast between the specificity of Ambrogio Lorenzetti’s contemporary martyrdom scene and Giotto’s *Saint Francis Before the Sultan*. Thirteenth- and fourteenth-century writers with first-hand knowledge of various Eastern European, West Asian, Central Asian, and East Asian groups such as Marco Polo, John of Plano Carpini, William of Rubruck, and others, certainly distinguished between Mongols and other groups, but it is unclear if this distinction was made more broadly in the medieval *imaginaires* of various European cities.

Mongol subjects certainly did make the trip from East Asia to Europe in the thirteenth century. Rabban Sauma, the Nestorian monk who traveled from the Yuan capital, Dadu (present-day Beijing), in 1275/6 first to Tabriz in the Ilkhanate and then onto Rome, Genoa, Paris, and London in 1287, laden with gifts from the Ilkhan Arghun (r. 1284-1291), describes his reception in various cities of Italy, France, and England in his travels. The only artist mentioned here who might have encountered or heard first
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653 Another important source for this period is the Armenian prince Hethum of Korykos’ (c. 1235-c.1314) *La flor des estoires de la terre d’Orient* from 1307. See passages from the 16th century English translation recounting the history of the Mongol (Tartar) conquests over Cumans, Kipchaks and others quoted in Dimitri Korobeinikov, “A Broken Mirror: The Kipçak World in the Thirteenth Century,” in *The Other Europe in the Middle Ages: Avars, Bulgars, Khazars and Cumans*, ed. Florin Curta and Roman Kovalev (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 380 note 4; 383-384.

hand accounts of Rabban Sauma’s party is Giotto; the others were a generation younger. As aforementioned however, Giotto’s depictions of Mongol-like figures are much vaguer than those executed by later Northern Italian painters; he appears to conflate “Tartars” with “Saracens.” The relative specificity of Mongol figures in trecento paintings, at least in regard to their dress, coupled with what we know of the reception of Marco Polo’s account, alongside potential first-hand observations of “Tartars” in Italy and France, all seem to indicate that there was some notion of the specificity of Mongols.

Europeans in the region of Germany in the thirteenth century also appear to have had a specific notion of “Tartars.” In John of Plano Carpini’s Ystoria mongolorum (1247) we read that Carpini and his travel companions refuse the accompaniment of “Tartar” ambassadors from Güyük Khan (r. 1246-1248) to Germany not only because they fear that the ambassadors are in fact spies, but also because he worried that they might be killed by his countrymen: “we were apprehensive that they might be killed, for our people are for the most part arrogant and proud. When at the request of the Cardinal, who is legate in Germany, the servants with us went to him wearing Tartar costume, they were very nearly stoned by the Germans on the way and were obliged to take off the costume.” This seems to support our hypothesis regarding how the Mongols were conceived in Northern Italy, that their dress was one of the defining factors in determining their identity. What “Tartar costume” signified, however, might be simply an
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655 Scholars who have attempted to determine whether such painters had actually seen Mongols often make problematic arguments about physical characteristics of the painted Mongols, such as eye shape. See for example, Tanaka, 185.

656 Christopher Dawson, Mission to Asia (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980), 68.
iteration of Central Asian riding coats paired with trousers, belts, and pointed hats. We do not know from the description if specific materials were associated with this dress. As with the painted examples in Italy, there may have been a specific sense of what “Tartar/Tatar” signified, but the label was applied very generally. This is corroborated on the next page of Carpini’s account where we read, “C[u]mans…counted as Tartars.” Cumans, a nomadic Turkic population, appear to have been conflated with the Mongols as “Tartars” in the European mind due to their dress and general demeanor, despite the fact that travelers such as John of Plano Carpini and others were clearly aware that they were distinct from Mongols.

The impact of the Mongols in the imaginaire of denizens of certain European cities such as Florence, Siena, Genoa, Paris, London, and parts of present-day Germany is a topic of great interest that should be pursued in a future study. The evidence, from pictorial depictions and texts, gives us tantalizing glimpses into the reach of the Mongols into the consciousness of populations across Europe. The works mentioned here are but a few examples of a larger number of trecento paintings and illuminations containing Mongol elements. A better understanding of the role that Mongols played in the Italian, and perhaps greater “European” imaginary during this period help better understand the

657 The range of people considered “Tatar” or Tatar” in this period is discussed in Harry Norris, Islam in the Baltic: Europe’s Early Muslim Community (London: I.B. Tauris, 2009), 207-208.
659 For historical background of the Cumans in medieval Eurasia see Korobeinikov, 329-412.
formation of the Italian and European identity that is normally associated with the
sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the next great period of global exchange.
Chinese-English Textile and Dress Glossary

10th-14th century terms, including definitions with historical, material, and pictorial references where possible

A

anhuā 暗花 – Patterns formed using the same threads as the ground warp or weft, often used to describe damask or patterned gauzes (see YS, juan 105, 2680; SS, juan 86, 2127).

anhuáduān 暗花緞 – Monochrome satin damask. This kind of monochrome textile, bound in satin, first appeared in the Yuan dynasty, although the term was not used until the Qing dynasty. It is made with the same weave structure in the pattern and ground, but because the warp and weft reflect the light at different angles, “light” and “dark” areas are perceived (see Kuhn, Chinese Silks, 521).

anjiāxìng zhījīnjīn 暗夾型織金錦 – See Jin 錦

B

bèizhī 背織 – Literally “back woven.” This term may refer to what today are called Liao-style samite weaves. See Liaoshi zhījīn 遼式織錦 (see Kuhn, Chinese Silks, 521).

bì 鞊/韡 – Leather puttees or arm guards worn from at least the Liao dynasty (see LS, juan 56, 905; YS, juan 78, 1931).

biǎn 弁 – Man’s cap worn allegedly from the Zhou dynasty (see LS, juan 56, “Han dress,” 907; YS, juan 78, 1929).

biānxìān ào 編織(織) – “Braided waist” (robe). A type of robe worn in the Yuan dynasty with a tight-fitting upper section, narrow-sleeves, a waist made up by a series of horizontal braids or ribbons, with many tiny pleats where the skirt of the robe connects to the waist (see figs. 2.43-2.50; YS, juan 78, 1941).

bìxī 偏舄 – Type of narrow shoes worn by the Emperor in the Jin dynasty (see JS, juan 43, 975).

bìxī 蔽膝 – Literally “knee cover;” a sort of apron skirt worn by the emperor from at least the Song and Liao dynasties (see LS, juan 56, 908; JS,
bo 布 – General term for all sorts of silk fabrics (used Han and later) (see Kuhn, *Chinese Silks*, 521; *YS, juan* 78, 1930).

boli 鈸笠 – Type conical hat worn by the Yuan emperor with his summer zhisun robes (see Anige, *Portrait of Ayurbarwada* (Renzong), Yuan dynasty, album leaf, colors and ink on silk, 59.4 x 47 cm, National Palace Museum, Taipei; *YS, juan* 78, 1938).

buzi 補子 – Central pattern or badge featured on the back and front of a robe beginning in the Jin dynasty and flourishing in the Yuan. See xiongbei (胸背) (see *JS, juan* 132, 2821).

C

chang 楓 – Cloak (see *SS, juan* 143, 3371-3372).

chang 衣 – Skirt-like part of imperial dress in China (see *LS, juan* 56, 908; *JS, juan* 43, 981; *YS, juan* 78, 1930).

changfu 常服 – “Ordinary dress,” a type of Chinese court dress worn by the emperor and high officials. In the Liao dynasty this was one of six types of “Khitan state style” dress and one of the four types of “Han-style” dress. We read in the *Liao shi* that the “Khitan state style” version it was used in diplomatic ceremonies and included green floral motifs on a robe with a red or green under-robe, and a fur coat (the quality of fur depended on the rank of the official). The “Han-style” was a flat cloth hat and long robe. (see *LS, juan* 56, 907; see also *JS, juan* 43, 983).

chaofu 朝服 – “Court dress,” a type of Chinese court dress worn by the emperor and high officials. In the Liao dynasty this was one of six types of “Khitan state style” dress and one of the four types of “Han-style” dress. We read in the *Liao shi* that the “Khitan state style” version was worn for investiture ceremonies. Liao imperial “court dress” included an embroidered red robe, and a rhino horn and jade decorated belt, which was embellished by Liao Taizong (r. 926-947 CE) by adding a “brocaded” robe and a gold belt. (see *LS, juan* 56, 905 and 908; see also *JS, juan* 43, 982; *YS, juan* 78, 1930).

chen 襯 – Lining, liner; in the *Jin shi* it is used to describe the plain weave silk (juan 絹).
and silk gauze (luo 羅) linings of the empress’ crown and sash (shou 綬), respectively. In the Yuan shi this term is used to describe the silk gauze (luo 羅) lining of the emperor’s shoes. (see JS, juan 43, 978; YS, juan 78, 1932).

chou 緬– Coarse textured and unpatterned tabby silk fabric of the Song and Ming eras. Chou with gold threads or gilded chou of the Song has a twill ground weave; General term used to designate a silk fabric (see LS, juan 56, 905; Kuhn, Chinese Silks, 521; Riboud, “Brief account of textiles, 45) (See also).

cixiu 刺繡– See xiù 繡

D

dai 帶– Belt (See LS, juan 56, 906; JS, juan 43, 982-983; YS, juan 78, 1931-1932).

diexie dai 踐/鞵 踐帶– A belt made of leather with leather strips and useful accoutrements such as pouches that hang from it

die 靴/韝 – Type of gold hanging ornament (usually hung from the belt) worn by Tanguts, Khitan, and other semi-nomadic people (see LS, juan 56, 906, 910; Laursen, “Leaves That Sway,” 183; mural in Dunhuang cave 418 in Shen Congwen, Zhongguo gudai fushi yanjiu, 359)

dana 答納– Pearl, from the Persian word dāna. Used in the Yuan dynasty to decorate the summer imperial zhisun robe (see YS, juan 78, 1938).

danwei zuzhi 單位組織– A pattern or weave unit. Also known as the smallest repeat unit of a weave (see Kuhn, Chinese Silks, 521).

diexie dai 蹈褭帶– See Dài 帶

dingjincai xiu 釘金彩繡– See xiù 繡

doumou 兜鍪– Helmet, in the Yuan dynasty this type of helmet matched the color the armor of the person wearing it (see YS, juan 78, 1940).

duanwen(zhi) 銅紋 (繭)– Satin (weave), one of the three weave structures of Chinese silks. First appearing in the late Tang dynasty, duanwen is a weave with a lustrous surface, a smooth appearance, and a soft, slippery feel. Dorothy Burnham defines it as a basic binding weave (plain or patterned) based on a unit of five or more ends, and a number of picks equal to, or a multiple
of, the number of ends. Note that the binding points for satin are set over two or more ends on successive picks. Over the years, many distinctive satin weaves were created; those with a floating warp are called “warp satin,” those with a floating weft are referred to as “weft satin” (see Kuhn, *Chinese Silks*, 522).

**duanwen weijin** 鍄紋緯錦— Satin samite, a polychrome compound satin that is weft-faced on both sides (see Kuhn, *Chinese Silks*, 522).

**F**

**faju** 法服 — “Formal dress,” or “Standard dress,” a type of Chinese court dress. The term is used in the *Liao shi* as “standard dress” and probably referred to Han-style court dress. In the *Jin shi* it is used as the equivalent of “court dress” (*chao fu*) and was worn by high officials. The Tangut imperial dragon roundel robe may have been a type of “formal dress,” as was the dress worn by Song Emperor Huizong (r. 1067-1086) and his mother, the Empress Dowager Biangzhi, as yet another type of “formal dress” (see *LS*, juan 56, 911; *JS*, juan 43, 975; Chen Gaohua and Xu Jijun, *Zhongguo fushi tongshi*, 382 note 5, 383).

**fang xin qu ling** 方心曲領— A type of round, white collar worn by the emperor as part of court dress (see *LS*, juan 56, 908; *JS*, juan 43, 979; *YS*, juan 78, 1935; fig. 1.33)

**feng** 缝— to stitch, to sew (see *LS*, juan 56, 906; *JS*, juan 43, 985; *YS*, juan 78, 1931)

**fu** 幅— A pass, or one complete unit of weft threads (also known as lats); also a width of cloth (Zhou and later), in particular a width of silk tabby (Song and later) (see Dieter Kuhn, *Chinese Silks*, 522; *LS*, juan 56, 906; *JS*, juan 43, 976; *YS*, juan 78, 1931).

**fu** 紃— An embroidered pattern of black and white on imperial robes often paired with the **fu** (黻) pattern (see *LS*, juan 56, 908; *JS*, juan 43, 978; *YS*, juan 78, 1931-1932).

**fu** 繖— An embroidered pattern of black and blue on imperial robes often paired with the **fu** (黻) pattern (see *LS*, juan 56, 908; *JS*, juan 43, 979, 981; *YS*, juan 78, 1931-1932).

**fu** 幌/袂 [頭]— Cloth- (head) wrapper, clothing covering; turban; headdress; part of
Han-style ordinary dress for officials in the Liao dynasty; part of official dress for the hundred officials in the Yuan dynasty (see LS, juan 56, 910; JS, juan 43, 973; YS, juan 78, 1939).

fubian 幅邊 – The selvage, or woven edges of a finished textile (see Dieter Kuhn, Chinese Silks, 522).

G

gongfu 公服 – “Official dress,” a type of court dress worn by the emperor and high officials in middle period China. In the Liao dynasty this was one of six types of “Khitan state style” dress, and one of the four type of “Han-style” dress. The emperor’s “Khitan state style” official dress consisted of a purple-black turban and a narrow purple robe, a jade belt, and sometimes a red overcoat, while official wore a purple robe and a headdress. In the Yuan dynasty the official dress of the one hundred officials was made of luo-gauze, had wide sleeves, a rounded collar, and closed on the right side; decoration on these robes was based on rank (see LS, juan 56, 906; JS, juan 43, 982; YS, juan 78, 1939).

guan 冠 – Cap, crown, headgear

gugu guan 罩罟冠／固姑冠／顧姑冠 – Also known as boqta/ boghta, a type of headdress worn by married noble Mongol women made of a cylindrical structure of birch bark, covered with felt or silk, and elaborated with jewels and feathers. Pictorial examples are often red; there are some excavated examples made of nasīj (see Zhao Hong, Meng da bei lü, shuo xuan 12; [Li Zhichang, The Travels of an Alchemist, 67; figs. 2.55, 2.58, 2.59, 2.61, 2.62]

jinhua guan 金花冠 – Tiara worn by male Uighur nobility in the 9th-12th centuries (see Shen Congwen, Zhongguo gudai fushi yanjiu, 254; figs. 1.7, 1.26).

sanliang guan 三梁冠 – “Triple ridge hat.” A type of hat worn during the Liao dynasty by the heir apparent as part of “Han-style” court dress; worn by rank 6 and 7 officials as part of “court dress” during the Jin dynasty. This hat, and variations with more peaks, the “quadruple ridge hat” (siliang guan 四梁冠), “quintuple ridge hat” (wuliang guan 五梁冠), and “septuple ridge hat” (qiliang guan 七梁冠), were also worn by officials as part of court dress in the Jin and Yuan dynasties (LS juan 56, 908; JS, juan 43, 980; YS, juan 78, 1935, 1937).
shilixueguan 實里薛袞冠 – A type of hat worn by the Liao emperor as part of Khitan state-style ceremonial dress, transliterated from Khitan language (see LS, juan 56, 906).

tongtian guan 通天冠 – “Accessing heaven” hat, an ancient ceremonial hat, tying under the chin and curling at its peak. Also known as Ping ding guan (平釘冠), Juan yun guan (卷雲冠), Ping mian (平冕), often abbreviated as Tongtian. Worn by the emperor in the Liao dynasty as part of “Han-style” court dress (see Wu Shan, Zhongguo lidai fuzhuang, ranzhi, cixiu cidian, 165; LS, juan 56, 908; JS, juan 56, 976-977, 981; fig. 1.33):

yishan guan 翼善冠 – “Winged virtue” crown. A type of crown worn by the emperor in the Liao dynasty as part of “Han-style” official dress (see LS, juan 56, 909).

yuanyou guan 遠遊冠 – “Distant wanderings” hat. A type of hat worn by the heir apparent in the Liao dynasty as part of “Han-style” court dress and by the heir apparent in the Jin dynasty as part of court dress (see LS, juan 56, 908; JS, juan 43, 979).

zhuzi juanyun guan 珠子捲雲冠 – “Pearls and curling clouds hat,” a type of hat worn with the emperor’s summer zhisun/jisün robe in the Yuan dynasty (see YS, juan 78, 1938).

gun 袢 – General term used for ceremonial dress for royalty or imperial robe (see Liao shi, juan 56, 906, 908; JS, juan 43, 981; YS, juan 78, 1930).

gunmian 袢冕 – General term for imperial dress or robes and headgear, part of “Han-style” ceremonial dress in the Liao dynasty (LS, juan 56, 908; JS, juan 43, 981; YS, juan 78, 1932).

H

haiqing 海青 – Robe with underarm openings, sometimes referred to as an “all weather” robe (present-day usage, not historical) (see Zhao Feng, Gold, Silk, Blue and White, 52; figs. 3.9-3.13)

hu 殼 – Fine silk gauze; crêpe; a thin and loosely woven tabby silk fabric (of high-twist threads) with a crinkled surface (Tang and later, with material evidence from Shang times). Part of the empress’ dress in the Jin dynasty (see JS, juan 43, Kuhn, Chinese Silks, 522).
huanbian xiu 環編繡 – See xiu 繡

J

jiaxie 夾(纈) – Clamp-resist dying; the pattern is carved on two interlocking blocks that are placed on either side of the textile and pressed together creating a printed pattern (JS, juan 43, 972; YS, juan 78, 1937).

jie 結 – Tie, knit, knot, weave (LS, juan 56, 906; JS, juan 43, 973; YS, juan 78, 1930).

jifu 祭服 – “Ceremonial dress,” a type of dress worn by the emperor and high officials. In the Liao dynasty this was one of six types of “Khitan state style” dress and one of the four type of “Han-style” dress. In the Liao dynasty the emperor’s ceremonial dress was black and red with the “twelve imperial symbols” patterned on it. (see LS, juan 56, 905-906; JS, juan 43, 980; YS, juan 78, 1935-1937; Thirteen emperor’s scroll figs. 1.30-1.31).

jin 錦 – “Brocade.” May refer to a textile woven with discontinuous supplementary wefts or the action of weaving with a supplementary weft introduced into a ground weave, the movement of which is limited to the width of the area where it is required, and which does not travel from selvage to selvage. In historical documents (in Europe and Asia) “brocade” may refer to any textile with a woven pattern, especially in gold or silver. The term jin was used throughout Chinese imperial times to refer to a wide variety of polychrome silk fabrics without indicating whether the ornamentation is from supplementary warp or weft. The term may refer to warp-faced polychrome compound twill weaves, weft-faced polychrome compound tabby weaves (taqueté), and weft-faced polychrome compound twill weaves (samite). The term is used to describe various types of court and official dress in the Liao, Jin, and Yuan dynasties (See CIETA Vocabulary of Technical Terms, 15; WSWG, 213; Kuhn, Chinese Silks, 523; Riboud, “A brief account of textiles excavated in dated Liao dynasty,” 44; LS, juan 56, 906; JS, juan 43, 972; YS, juan 78, 1936).

anjiaying zhijinjin 暗夾型織金錦 – Gold weft-faced compound jin (錦 “brocade”) weave in tabby or twill, distinguished from nasīj because nasīj is lampas weave and therefore features a binding warp (see Zhao Feng, Chinese Silks, 334; figs. 2.29, 2.43).

jin jin 金錦 – A textile woven with an all over gold effect, created either by a discontinuous supplementary weft (wasuo 挖梭) in gold or a continuous weft in gold (tongsuo 同梭). In the Liao and Jin dynasties this may refer to
**Jin duanzi** (金段子). In the Yuan dynasty this is called *nashishi* (納失失／納石失, also known as *nasīj*) and is used specifically for the emperor’s *jisün/zhisun* suits (see *YS, juan* 78, 1938; Kuhn, *Chinese Silks*, 523).

**liaoshi zhi jin** (遼式織錦) — “Liao-style samite.” A compound twill with weft-facing on both sides woven right-side facing down and requiring a pattern loom equipped with both lifting and lowering shafts first produced in the late Tang and Liao eras, and is also sometimes called “half outer warp” polychrome double-faced compound weft twill *jin* (see Kuhn, *Chinese Silks*, 524; Zhao Feng, *Treasures in Silk*, 155; fig. 1.16).

**tejie jin** (特結錦) — Lampas, a type of *jin* fabric that made its appearance in China during the Yuan dynasty as the *nasīj* woven with gold threads. In *tejiejin*-figured weaves, a pattern composed of floating patterning wefts bound by a supplementary binding warp of either tabby or twill would be added to a ground or foundation weave formed by a ground (or main) warp and ground (or main) weft (see Kuhn, *Chinese Silks*, 527).

**wenjin** (紋錦) — A “patterned brocade,” sometimes used to describe samite (weft-faced compound twill) weave. (see *YS, juan* 85, 2147, 2151; Wang Pu, *Tang hui yao, juan* 99, 9-1; Zhao Feng, Wang Le, and Wang Mingfang, “Study on Two Brocade Robes, 66-73; fig. 1.3).

**zhijin jin** (錦金錦) — “Gilt brocade,” a general term that usually refers to cloth with a continuous supplementary weft pattern in gold, also known as *nasīj* in the Mongol Period (13th-14th centuries). See also *Nashishi* (納失失／納石失) (see Zhao Feng, *Gold, Silk, Blue and White*, 54).

**jinduanzi** (金段子) — Tabby or twill weave silks woven with repeat patterns in a supplementary gold or silvered weft made of flat or wrapped gilded or silvered threads produced in the Liao and later. Used in historical texts from the Yuan period (see Kuhn, *Chinese Silks*, 523; Zhao Feng, *Chinese Silks*, 334; Shen Jiaben, *Yuan dianzhang*, 1982; figs. 1.17, 1.18, 1.39, 2.10-2.15, 2.18, 2.19).

**jin huaguan** (金花冠) — See *Guan* 冠

**jin jin** (金錦) — See *Jin* 錦

**jing** (經) — Warp, warp threads (see *JS, juan* 43, 980; Kuhn, *Chinese Silks*, 523).

**jingmian** (經面) — Warp-faced weave. A kind of woven material whose warp threads
dominate the weave pattern when viewed from the front (see Kuhn, *Chinese Silks*, 523).

**juan 纖**—Plain/tabby weave silk, one of the most basic types of silk weave, with densely woven warp and weft threads creating a fine, smooth texture. In historical texts it is described as a lining for imperial dress (in the Jin and Yuan), and for the robes of those in subordinate positions such as soldiers (in the Yuan). Historically *juan* was made of white raw silk. Archaeological evidence of *juan* silks dates to as early as Shang times. (see *JS, juan* 43, 972, 978; *YS, juan* 78, 1930, 1937, 1940; Kuhn, *Chinese Silks*, 524; Riboud, “A brief account of textiles excavated in dated Liao dynasty,” 43).

**Kesi**—Chinese silk tapestry. Literally “incised silk,” “cut silk,” or carved silk” tapestry, in which the weave is composed of one warp and a weft composed of threads of different colors made in the Yuan dynasty of both silk and gilded or silvered threads. The weft threads do not pass from selvage to selvage but are carried back and forth, interweaving with only the part of the warp that is required for a particular pattern area, and the binding is usually tabby and weft-faced. The technique originated from wool tapestry weaving. Archaeological evidence for *kesi* exists in China from the 3rd century BCE, but it became popular beginning in the Tang dynasty thanks to Uighur production (see Kuhn, *Chinese Silks*, 524; Zhao Feng, *Treasures in Silk*, 337; CIETA, *Vocabulary of Technical Terms*, 43; Sheng, “Chinese Silk Tapestry,” 70; Riboud, “A brief account of textiles excavated in dated Liao dynasty,” 44; *WSWG*, 213; figs.1.22, 2.16, 2.17, 2.20, 2.22, 2.23, 3.36).

**kuang 纏**—Silk floss, silk wadding used as insulation in robes and other dress items (see *LS, juan* 56, 908; *JS, juan* 43, 976, 979; *YS, juan* 78, 1930, 1931)

**L**

**lan 襤**—full-length robe (see *LS, juan* 56, 907; *JS, juan* 43, 977; *YS, juan*, 1937)

**li 裏**—lining for clothing, in the Jin-Yuan dynasties often described as being made of tabby-weave silk (*juan 纖*) (see *LS, juan* 56, 907; *JS, juan* 43, 978; *YS, juan*, 1930).

**liaoshi zhijin 遼式織錦**—See *Jin 錦*

**ling 靑**—Twill damask, formed by a warp-faced and a weft-faced binding, such as the
four-end twill damask. There are 2 types of ling, plain (suling 素綾) or patterned (hualing 花綾). In historical texts it was used for a variety of imperial clothing: in the Liao the emperor’s robe for the most important sacrifices is made of ling; in the Jin dynasty as a lining of robes; in the Yuan dynasty used on the emperor’s socks and the lining for his shoes. (see LS, juan 56, 906; JS, juan 43, 977; YS, juan, 1931, 1932; Kuhn, Chinese Silks, 524; Riboud, “A brief account of textiles excavated in dated Liao dynasty, 44).

suling 素綾 – Plain ling with only one twill or derived twill. Described in the Song dynasty as edging for scrolls (see Sima Guang, Zizhi tongjian, juan 275, 8995; Riboud, “A brief account of textiles excavated in dated Liao dynasty,” 44)

hualing 花綾 – Patterned ling twill damask – a patterned fabric with a twill pattern on a twill ground. There are two maid categories in patterned ling: (1) when the pattern weave has the same number of threads repeated in the weave unit but with the twill in opposite direction, ex. 3/1 twill (warp faced) and 1/3 twill (weft faced); (2) when the ground weave and the pattern weave have not the same number of thread repeated in the weave unit, for example, a 2/1 twill warp-faced) for the ground and a 1/5 twill (weft-faced) for the pattern. (see Riboud, “A brief account of textiles excavated in dated Liao dynasty,” 44; Kuhn, Chinese Silks, 522; Wang Pu, Tang huiyao, juan 31, 569, juan 75, 1364; SS, juan 163, 3842, 3846).

liu 旒 – Streamer, pennant; jade pendants on a crown; in the Song/Liao-Yuan dynasties the name for the pendants on the mian (冕) crown (see LS, juan 56, 908; SS, juan 115, 2726, 2729; JS, juan 43, 974; YS, juan 78, 1931).

liusu 流蘇 – A tassel. This could be made out of various colored silk, or metallic materials (see YS, juan 38, 1700, 1703).

lou 縗 – Thread, in the Song/Jin-Yuan dynasties often used for metallic thread, jinlou 金縗 or loujin 縗金 (SS, juan 112, 2681; JS, juan 43, 977, 978; YS, juan 78, 1940).

luo 罗 – In Han times, luo referred to a net made of silk threads used for catching birds. Later it came to mean a gauze textile woven without a fixed relationship between the crossing ends and the fixed ends, that is, complex luo gauzes (tongjiao luo 同絞羅). In luo, the warp thread is usually loosely twisted and weft thread is not twisted. There are two types of luo: (1) a type of gauze known as “horizontal”, where the gauze wefts are separated by 3 or
more wefts in plain weave; (2) a type of gauze known as “vertical”; it is called plain gauze (su luo 素羅) or patterned gauze (hua luo 花羅). Complex gauzes were popular during the Liao/Song through Yuan dynasties. (see Kuhn, Chinese Silks, 525; Riboud, “A brief account of textiles excavated in dated Liao dynasty,” 44; Wu Shan, Zhongguo lidai fuzhuang, ranzhi, cixiu cidian, 344; LS, juan 56, 905; JS, juan 43, 976, 977; YS, juan 78, 1940, 1941, 1942).

anhua luo 暗花羅- Monochrome silk gauze damask (see Zhu Xi, Zhuzi wenji, juan 18, 627).

hua luo 花羅- Patterned complex silk gauze; a generic term for patterned gauze. Examples from the Han dynasty are found in Mawangdui Tombs M1 and M3. (see Kuhn, Chinese Silks, 522; Wu Shan, Zhongguo lidai fuzhuang, ranzhi, cixiu cidian, 345; SS, juan 152, 3539, 3550; JS, juan 43, 982; YS, juan 78, 1936; Dragons of Silk Flowers of Gold cat. 18).

su luo 素羅- Plain silk gauze. Su luo has a warp that can be twisted, loosely twisted, or not twisted at all. Based on the specific twist of the warp it can be divided into double-twisted warp luo, triple-twisted warp luo, and even quadruple-twisted warp luo. (Wu Shan, Zhongguo lidai fuzhuang, ranzhi, cixiu cidian, 344; JS, juan 43, 982; YS, juan 68, 1703, juan 79, 1969).

M

mabu 麻布 – Hemp, linen [cloth]. Often used for summer clothing and in the clothes of the common people (see LS, juan 56, 905; JS, juan 43, 972; YS, juan 78, 1941).

mao 帽– General term for hat, sometimes referring to winter hats (see LS, juan 56, 906; JS, juan 43, 973, 975; YS, juan 78, 1938).

mian 絲– Silk floss. Described in the Yuan shi as lining for the emperor’s summer jisün/zhisun robes (see JS, juan 43, 977, 986; YS, juan 78, 1938).

mian 冕– Crown worn by the emperor (and senior officials) in the form of a horizontal board with pendants hanging from both ends. Also found as part of a compound word for imperial dress generally (mianfu 冕服 or gunmian 哀冕) (see LS, juan 56, 907; JS, juan 43, 979; YS, juan 78, 1929, 1930; Wu Shan, Zhongguo lidai fuzhuang, ranzhi, cixiu cidian, 163; figs. 1.30, 1.31).
nashishi 納失失／納石失 - From the Arabic nasīj, “cloth of gold and silk.” *Nashishi* is an early lampas weave (*tejiejin* 特結錦) with a continuous overall pattern in flat or round gold threads. A prestige fabric used in the Yuan dynasty for official and imperial dress, especially *jisün/zhisun* robes. During the beginning of the Mongol period in East Asia, *nashishi* was imported from Central Asia; in the Yuan dynasty it was woven in imperial workshops. See also *Zhijjinjin* (織金錦). See also Arabic clothing and textiles glossary (see *YS*, juan 78, 1931, 1938; Dozy, *Supplément aux Dictionnaires Arabes*, 666; Kuhn, *Chinese Silks*, 525; Wu Shan, *Zhongguo lidai fuzhuang, ranzhi*, *cixiu cidian*, 325-326; figs. 2.8, 2.9, 2.36, 2.44, 2.46, 2.56, 2.61, 2.62, 3.28).

nayan 納言 - A type of head wrapper or hat, worn under the *mian* headdress (*JS*, juan 43, 976; *YS*, juan 78, 1931).

nang 囊 - Bag, pocket, or something shaped like a bag. In the Liao and Jin dynasties, these were sometimes worn attached to the belt (*LS*, juan 56, 910; *JS*, juan 43, 971).

nianjin jin 捻金錦 - Polychrome *jin* (錦) fabric with “twisted gold threads,” gold threads made of a core thread with a strip of gold wrapped around (see Kuhn, *Chinese Silks*, 525).

nianjin xian 撚金線 - “twisted” gold thread – ie made by winding gold around a core, usually of silk. Used in the Jin dynasty to describe the decoration of the empress’ *shou 繡* (see *JS*, juan 43, 978).

P

pan 鞶 - Large belt (*LS*, juan 56, 910; *JS*, juan 43, 973, 974).

panling yi 盤領衣 - “Flat collared” robe, described in the *Jin shi* as one of the four elements of Jin dynasty “ordinary dress” (*changfu 常服*). It was often white, with narrow sleeves and a “flat” collar, ie. a high, round collar (see *JS*, juan 43, 984; fig. 1.38).

pei 佩 - Something worn at the waist (such as a piece of jade, a knife, or a bag), usually attached to a belt: to wear at the waist (see *LS*, juan 56, 906, 908, 910; *JS*, juan 43, 976, 985; *YS*, juan 78, 1932, 1934).

pei shou 佩綬 - A hanging *shou* (sash) (see *LS*, juan 56, 908, 909; Shen Congwen, *Zhongguo gudai fushi yanjiu*, 359)
**pei die 佩die** – A gold ornament hanging from the belt. Illustrated on a Tangut donor in Dunhuang cave 418 (see Shen Congwen, *Zhongguo gudai fushi yanjiu*, 359).

Q

**qi 綺** – Monochrome figured silk with patterns produced in twill on a tabby ground weave. There is material evidence of qi silk beginning from the Shang period (see *LS, juan* 56, 905; Riboud, “A brief account of textiles excavated in dated Liao dynasty,” 44; Kuhn, *Chinese Silks*, 526).

**qisha 漆紗** – See *Sha 紗*

**quanrong 圈絨** – See *Rong 絨*

R

**rong 絨** – Velvet, or any soft textile with a nap pile, soft wool, fine hair, down, embroidery floss. Prior to the 14th century the type of fabric indicated by rong is ambiguous. Velvet, that is silk that is woven on a loom with a stiff velvet rod is inserted during the weaving process to make loops in the warp threads was probably invented in the 14th century. “Uncut velvet” (quanrong 圈絨), that is, the fabric that comes off the velvet loom has a loop pile. If the loops are cut after the velvet rod is removed, the result is a velvet with a short pile called “plain velvet” (surong 素絨). (see *JS, juan* 43, 986; *YS, juan* 78, 1937; Kuhn, *Chinese Silks*, 526).

**quanrong 圈絨** – Also written *rongquan* 絨絨 Uncut velvet with a loop pile. The earliest known example in China is from the second century BCE. Used to describe a fabric at least from the Yuan dynasty (see Kuhn, *Chinese Silks*, 526; Riboud, “A brief account of textiles excavated in dated Liao dynasty,” 45; Shi Nai’an, *Shui hu quan zhuan*, hui 76, 1274).

S

**sadalaqi 撒答剌欺** - Used in the Yuan dynasty, likely a transliteration of the Persian word *zandanīji*, which in the Yuan probably referred to a silk textile. *Sadalaqi* was manufactured in one of textile workshops administered by the Ministry of Works of the Yuan government, the Supervisorate of Sadalaqi. See also Persian textiles and clothing glossary (see *YS, juan* 85, 2149; *WSWG*, 140; Kuhn, *Chinese Silks*, 526).
sanliang guan 三梁冠 - See guan 冠

sha 紗 – A fine, loose, soft tabby weave silk fabric with square holes that are evenly distributed over the woven surface; also a thin silk tabby or open-weave gauze; at least since Song times sha could also mean a simple or plain crossed-warp gauze weave. The earliest material finds in thin tabby weave are from Shang times. Used in the Song/Liao-Yuan period for under-robels (zhongdan 中單), hats, and belts (see LS, juan 56, 909, 910; JS, juan 43, 975, 976, 978; YS, juan 78, 1930, 1932, 1934, 1935; Kuhn, Chinese Silks, 526; Riboud, “A brief account of textiles excavated in dated Liao dynasty,” 43).

qisha 漆紗 – Literally “lacquered” gauze, this likely refers to sha gauze that has been patterned with painted designs. Used in the Yuan shi to describe materials used to make the emperor’s hat and belt (see YS, juan 78, 1930).

shi 紬 – A general term for rough, indelicate silk. In the Jin shi this describes the robes of the common people, in the Yuan shi it is one of the materials used to make soldiers’ robes (see JS, juan 43, 986; YS, juan 78, 1940, 1941; Riboud, “A brief account of textiles excavated in dated Liao dynasty,” 45).

shilixueguan 實里薛袞冠 – See Guan 冠

shigang 飾（品） – Ornament, item of jewelry, accessory (see LS, juan 56, 905, 906; JS, juan 43, 970, 971, 986; YS, juan 78, 1933, 1934, 1943)

shou 給 – A decorative sash hung from the belt worn by the imperial family and high officials to indicate rank (see LS, juan 56, 908, 909; JS, juan 43, 980; YS, juan 78, 1932, 1937; Zhao Feng, Gold Silk Blue and White, 89; figs. 1.30, 1.31)

sufu 速夫 – A word transliterated from the Arabic word, ṣūf, wool. Used in the Yuan dynasty to describe a type of fine woolen cloth produced in Central or West Asia. In the Yuan shi, this describes the emperor’s zhisun/jisün robes. See also Arabic clothing and textiles glossary (see YS, juan 78, 1938; Han Rulin, “Yuandai zhama yan xin tan,” 250-251; Thomas Allsen, Commodity and Exchange, 72; WSWG, 138).

suling 素綾 – See Ling 綾

suluo 素羅 – See Luo 羅
**surong 素絨— See Rong 絨**

**T**

**tejiejin 特結錦— See Jin 錦**

**tongtian guan 通天冠 — See Guan 冠**

**W**

**wa 靴— Socks, stockings, hose (see LS, juan 56, 909, 910; JS, juan 43, 976, 977; YS, juan 78, 1931, 1933, 1934).**

**wei 纹— Weft, woof, the transverse threads of a textile that run parallel to the width of the loom (see Kuhn, Chinese Silks, 528, Sima Guang, Zizhi tongjian, 29).**

**weimian 纹面— Weft-faced weave. A kind of woven material whose weft threads dominate the weave pattern when viewed from the front (see Dieter Kuhn, Chinese Silks, 528).**

**weiman 帷幔— Valance; heavy curtain (Wang Pu, Tang hui yao, juan 3, 5-1).**

**wenjin 紋錦— See Jin 錦**

**X**

**xiewen (zuzhi) 斜紋（組織）— Twill (weave), one of the three weave structures of Chinese silks. Twill is a weave based on a unit of three or more ends and three or more picks, in which each one passes over two or more adjacent picks and under the next one or more, or under two or more adjacent picks and over the next one or more. The binding points are set over by one end on successive picks, and form diagonal lines. Twills are identified as S (left) or Z (right) indicating the diagonal direction of the twill (see Kuhn, Chinese Silks, 528; Burnham, Warp and Weft, 7; Shi Nai’an, Shui hu quan zhuan, hui 61, 1028).**

**xiongbei 胸背— See also buzzi (補子). Decorative badge found on the front and back of Yuan dynasty robes. In the Ming and Qing dynasty these would become known as Mandarin Squares (see Tongzhi tiaoge, juan 9, 134; figs. 3.5-3.11).**

**xiu 糀— Embroider; embroidery (SS, juan 7, 136, juan 51, 1059; JS, juan 43, 981; YS, **
cixiu 刺繡 – Embroider; embroidery (see SS, juan 10, 198).

dingjincai xiu 釘金彩繡 - Gold couching technique embroidery. In the Yuan shi patterns are described being made by huanjin which may refer to couching or needle-loop embroidery (see YS, juan 78, 1932; Zhao Feng, Gold Silk Blue and White, 107; fig.1.21).

huanbian xiu 環編繡 – Needle-loop embroidery. In the Yuan shi patterns are described being made by huanjin which may refer to couching or needle-loop embroidery (see YS, juan 78, 1932; inv. no. 3226, China National Silk Museum)

Y

yahu 牙忽 – Hyacinth stone. From the Persian word yaqūt, hyacinth (stone). One of the precious stones that adorn the emperor’s zhisun/jisün suits in the Yuan dynasty. See Persian textile glossary (see YS, juan 78, 1938).

ying 繭– Tassel; something shaped like a tassel; ribbon (see LS, juan 56, 908, 909, 910; JS, juan 43, 974, 979; YS, juan 78, 1932, 1933, 1934).

yinshu 銀鼠– Ermine, weasel, or stoat. The fur of this animal was highly valued and worn by the Khitans, Jurchens, and Mongols, among others. It was one of the materials used for the emperor’s zhisun/jisün suits and hats (see LS, juan 56, 907; YS, juan 78, 1938; fig. 3.7).

yishan guan 翼善冠 – See Guan 冠

yuanyou guan 遠遊冠– See Guan 冠

yunjian 雲肩– Literally “cloud shoulder,” often referred to as “cloud collar”. A type of decorative motif found on textiles, ceramics, and other decorative arts beginning in the Jin dynasty and flourishing in the Yuan dynasty. Also found represented on robes in painted representations of Ilkhanid court scenes (see JS, juan 43, 908; YS, juan 78, 1940; figs. 1.38, 2.20, 2.21, 4.6)

Z

ze 幕– A man’s headdress or head-wraper, in the Liao shi always described as being black (see LS 56, 907, 908, 909, 910; JS, juan 43, 973; YS, juan 78, 1940).
zhama 詐馬 – Another name for the jisün/zhisun banquet in the Yuan dynasty. From the Persian jāmah, robe, garment, or vestment. See also zhisun 質孫 and Persian textile glossary (see Ke Jiusi, Liao Jin Yuan gong ci, 25; Han Rulin, “Yuandai zhama yan xin tan,” 248; Allsen, “Robing in the Mongolian Empire,” 305; WSWG, 138).

zhan 毯 / 毯 / 毯 – Felt, in the Liao shi used as material for hats of civil and military officials, in the Yuan shi used as filling for robes worn beneath the armor of military officials (see LS, juan 56, 906; YS, juan 78, 1936, 1937, 1940).

zhanchi fu tou 展翅袱頭 – Type of hat worn by the emperor and officials in the Song/Liao-Jin dynasties, black with thin, horizontal projections on each side of head (see Shen Congwen, Zhongguo gudai fushi yanjiu, 370; figs. 1.28, 1.29).

zhehuang 柘黃 – Yellow dye made from the bark of the three-bristle cudraria (Cudrania tricuspidata) or Chinese mulberry tree. Used to describe the color of the Liao emperor’s robe for “Han” style official dress and ordinary dress (see LS, juan 56, 909, 910).

zhi 織 – General term for a knit or weave or to knit or weave (see LS, juan 56, 905, 906; JS, juan 43, 976, 977, 978; YS, juan 78, 1931, 1932).

zhijinjin 織金錦 – See Jin 錦

zhisun 質孫/只孫 – The most important banquet in the Mongol period and Yuan dynasty. These banquets were named for the suit of clothes (hat, belt, and robe) that each of the attendees wore, which had been gifted prior to the banquet by the khan. Both the emperor and his officials would wear these monochrome suits, which in the Yuan dynasty were often made of nasīj. Zhisun is transliterated from the Mongol word jisūn meaning “of one color.” They were also known as zhama, see zhama 詐馬 (see YS 78 1938; Ke Jiusi, Liao Jin Yuan gong ci, 25; Han Rulin, “Yuandai zhama yan xin tan,” 251; Allsen, Commodity and Exchange, 19; Allsen, “Robing in the Mongolian Empire,” 305; WSWG, 138).

zhongdan 中單 – Inner robe in male dress in the Liao/Song-Yuan dynasties often made of white sha 紗 or juan 絹 silk (see LS, juan 56, 908, 909; JS, juan 43, 978, 979, 980; YS, juan 78, 1930, 1931).

zhongjia 衷甲 – A kind of armor worn under the clothes in the Liao dynasty. In the Liao
shi, Abaoji is described wearing this when he ascends the throne (see LS, juan 56, 906).

zhuan 襌 – Decorative patterning on the edges of clothing. in the Yuan shi this pattern describes a pattern on the emperor’s belt (see LS, juan 56, 909; JS, juan 43, 976, 977; YS, juan 78, 1931, 1932).

zhui 緞 – To sew or stitch; to embellish or decorate (see LS, juan 56, 906; JS juan 43, 978; YS, juan 78, 1932, 1933).

zhusi 紬絲／注絲 – Literally “ramie silk,” a fabric similar to satin, spun from a combination of fibers of silk and ramie. Zhusi possibly distinguished damask woven with combined fibers from ordinary silk damask. First appears as a term in the 12th century (see JS, juan 43, 986; YS, juan 78, 1936, 1937, 1942; WSWG, 139; Kuhn, Chinese Silks, 529).

zhuzi juanyun guan 珠子捲雲冠 – See Guan 冠

zi 紫– A color meaning “purple” or “violet” in modern Mandarin, this likely was a brownish-red or red color, especially before the Yuan dynasty. Zi is a color frequently attributed to the robes of officials in the Liao shi and the Jin shi. Zi-colored fabrics were dyed using something similar to madder (Rubia tinctorum) and dye from the plant known in Japanese as shinkon (紫根) or murasaki (紫) (Lithospermum purpurocaerula) (see LS, juan 56, 906, 908; JS, juan 43, 971; YS, juan 78, 1933, 1935; Kuhn, Chinese Silks, 529; figs. 2.16, 2.18, 2.19).
Arabic-English Textile and Dress Glossary


*Words in bold found within definition denote terms defined elsewhere in the glossary

aṭlas (pl. ūls) – see aṭlasiyya

aṭlasiyya – A satin robe; a garment, a piece of cloth of woven silk (see Dozy, vol. 2, 53; Lane vol. 5, p. 1867)

badan (pl. abdān) – A sleeveless tunic, woven of silk, worn in the west as well as in Arabic; a silk robe worn by Jews (see Dozy, vol. 1, 58; Dozy, Vet., 56-58; Lane vol. 1, p. 169)

banafsajī – Violet-colored; from the Persian banafsha (see Dozy, vol. 1, 118; Lane, vol. 1, 259).

burda – A cloak associated with gift by the Prophet Muhammad who had given it to a poet as a mark of respect; kind of garment, kind of striped garment according to some of the descriptions termed wasḥī, or variegated; later became associated with investiture ceremonies at Abbasid court; 16th century similar garment passed into Ottoman treasury (see Dozy vol. 1, 67; Dozy, Vet., 59-64; Lane, vol. 1, 184; Baker, “Islamic Honorific Garments,” 25).

bughlutāq (also bughlūṭāq) - A short sleeved or sleeveless coat that became popular in the Mamluk period, worn over a farajīyya made from a variety of fabrics including white Baalbek cotton, fur, or satin, sometime decorated with pearls, often entirely bejeweled. The same article of clothing known as Silārī Sallāriyya which was in vogue under the reign of Sultan al-Nāṣir Muhammad (c. 709-741/1310-1341) (see Dozy, vol. 1, 101; Dozy, Vet., 81-84; Stillman, Arab Dress, 69).

dībāj – Silk textile; silk brocade; a certain kind of garment made of ibrīsam; particularly a name for that which is variegated, decorated, or embellished. From Persian: dībā; Syriac: dibag; Armenian: dipak. Most frequently used term in Geniza letters (see Dozy, vol. 1, 421; Lane, vol. 3, 843; Serjeant, Islamic Textiles, 201; Gil, “References to Silk in Geniza Documents of the 11th Century,” 32).
farajiyya—An ample robe usually made of wool with long wide sleeves which slightly cover the hands without a slit, usually worn by those in the scholarly class (see Dozy, vol. 2, 248; Dozy, Vet., 327-328).

fawqāniyya—robe or mantle worn over the jubba, or a robe resembling the jubba; an uppercoat, generally long, reaching to the heels, ample in width and with long sleeves (see Dozy, vol. 2, 290; Dozy, Vet., 343-344; Lane, vol. 6, 2517).

ghazala/ghazila—to spin (cotton, flax, silk thread, etc.) (see Dozy, vol. 2, 211; Lane, vol. 6, 2255).

hāka (hayyaka)—to weave; to work with cloth or textiles; to knit; to sew; to interweave (see Dozy, Vet., 147-153; Lane, vol. 2, 673).

harār—Silk; a type of silk robe; dressed silk; a garment or textile made of silk (see Dozy, vol. 1, 263; Lane, vol. 2, 539).

ḥulla—A dress consisting of a waist-wrapper and a wrapper for the whole body; only applied to dress consisting of two garments of one kind; a type of textile; a type of linen garment brocaded with gold (see Dozy, vol. 1, 312; Lane, vol. 2, 621).

ibrīsam—Silk interwoven with cotton; silk (a synonym for harār), according to some, especially raw silk. Term used in the Geniza documents. [K175]. Ibrīsam is a loanword from Persian abrī-sham, probably used mainly in the eastern part of the Muslim world (see Biberstein-Kazimirski, Dictionnaire arabe-français vol. 1, 4; Dozy, vol. 1, p. 2; Lane, vol.1, 188; Gil, “References to Silk in Geniza Documents of the 11th Century,” 31-32).

ʿimāma (pl. ʿamāʾim/ʿimām)—Turban, a thing that one winds upon the head (see Dozy, Vet., 305-311; Lane, vol. 5, 2149).

jubba—A tailored garment; a double garment quilted with cotton; if of wool a single garment not quilted with anything; (see Dozy, Vet., 107-117; Lane, vol. 2, 371).

jūkha—Name of a garment made of woolen cloth; worn by distinguished men on rainy days (see Dozy, vol. 1, 230; Dozy, Vet., 127-131).

kāmiliyya (pl. kawāmil)—A fur-lined robe with sleeves, woven of wool or velvet (see Dozy, vol. 2, 489-490; Petry, “Robing Ceremonials in Late Mamluk Egypt,” 372; Mayer 62-63).
**khafṭān**, see **qafṭān**

**khil’a (pl. khila‘)** – Any robe which one pulls of or takes off from himself; particularly a garment which is bestowed upon a man, generally meaning a robe of honor; a gift; specially fabricated robes of honor sometimes woven of wool, without sleeves or fur lining; honorific gifts more generally (often taking the form of textiles) (see Lane, vol. 2, 791; Baker, P., “Islamic Honorific Garments,” 25; Petry, “Robing Ceremonials in Late Mamluk Egypt,” 373; Stillman, *Arab Dress*, 40).

**khirqa** – A piece or a piece torn off of a garment; a ragged, patched garment; an old torn and patched coat; a rough woolen cloak or robe worn by the Sūfī and Futuwwa as symbolic transfer of power and knowledge by placing on shoulders of initiate (see Dozy, vol. 1, 365; Dozy, Vet. 153-155; Lane, vol. 2, 729; Baker, “Islamic Honorific Garments,” 25; Stillman, *Arab Dress*, p. 51).

**kisā’** - A garment, a simple, oblong piece of cloth (see Dozy, vol. 2, 468; Dozy Vet. 383-386; Lane, supplement, 20).

**kiswa** – Clothing, clothes, apparel, garment, uniform. Also the covering of the Kaaba (see Dozy, vol. 2, 468-469 Wehr, 4th ed. 970;).

**küfiyya** (pl. kawafī) – A square made of coton, cotton and silk, or in silk with gold folded diagonally to be worn on the head; a thing that is worn upon the head (see Dozy vol. 2, 500; Dozy, Vet. 390-394; Lane, supplement, 24).

**mukhmal** – Textile made of of silk, wool, etc. with a long pile, as in velvet, velours, or nappy silk; a garment or a kisā’ having naps ( see Dozy vol. 1, 406; Lane, vol. 2, 813)

**nasaja** – To weave, to knit (see Dozy, vol. 2, 666; Lane, vol. 8, 2855-2856; Wehr, 4th ed. 1127).

**nasīj** – Woven fabric, textile. In the Mongol period, this appears to have been used only when referring to textiles woven with gold. “...the term *nasīj* stands in for the phrase *nasīj al-dhahab wa-l-harīr* [textile woven of gold and silk]…a textile woven with gold, a brocade...in Marco Polo, *nassit* and *nascisci*.” (see Dozy, vol. 2, 666; Lane, vol. 8, 2787).

**Qabā’ (pl. aqbiya)** – A general term for a robe; a luxurious, sleeved robe, slit in front with buttons (*muzarrar*), made of fabrics such as brocade (*dīḇāj*), of Persian provenance (see Dozy, vol. 2, 307; Dozy, Vet. 352-353; Lane,

**qaftān** – Arabic word for caftan, a fitted coat reaching below the knees, usually to mid-calf and sometimes lower, with buttons up the chest. From Persian *khaftān* (see Dozy, vol. 2, 383; Dozy, Vet., 162-168).

**qalansuwa tawīla** – a conical hat with a miter-like appearance and described in Arabic sources as being shaped like a sugar loaf (*qālab sukkar*). It is also described as an inverted amphora (*dann*), and hence was later nicknamed *danniyya*. It consisted of a frame of reed or wood covered with silk or other fabric (see Dozy, vol. 2, 401; Dozy, Vet., 365-371; Lane, vol. 7, 2558-2559; Stillman, *Arab Dress*, 35).

**qamīṣ** – A shirt or a shift (from the late Latin *camisia*), worn by both sexes (see Dozy, Vet., 371-375; Lane, vol. 7, 2564).

**qaṣab (pl. qiṣāb)** – A fine, thin, delicate, soft garments of linen; decorated with gold and silver; in Persian, silk textile; in Egypt, embroidered textile in which small strips of gold or silver are inlaid (see Dozy, vol. 2, 353-354; Lane, vol. 7, 2530).

**quaṭān**, see **qaftān**

**qundus** – Beaver (see Dozy, vol. 2, 410).

**qunduz** – see **qundus**

**sarāwil** – see **sirwāl**

**sallāriyya** – see **silārī**

**sammūr** – sable, *mustela zibellina* or viverra zibellina; also a *jubba* or any garment made with its fur; sometimes confused with beaver by Arab authors, which they also call by the same name (see Dozy vol. 1, 683; Lane, vol. 4, 1426).

**sharbūsh** – A high triangular cap which was worn without a turban. It was the distinctive headgear of amīrs. (see Dozy, vol. 1, 742; Dozy, Vet., 220-224).

**shiqqa** – The half of a garment consisting of two oblong pieces sewn together, later applied to such a garment when complete; often refers to an oblong piece of cloth or those pieces of which a tent is composed; piece of linen or goat hair used to make a tent (see Dozy, vol. 1, 773; Lane, vol. 4, 1578).
shirwāl - see sirwāl

silārī – A sleeveless or short-sleeved tunic, in vogue during reign of Sultan al-Nāsir Muhammad (c. 709-741/1310-1341) named after his amīr Silār. See also bughlūṭāq (see Dozy, vol. 1, 673; Dozy, Vet., 209-210).

sinjāb – An Arabicized Perisan word meaning gray squirrel, miniver; furred garments made with the skin of this animal, the best of which are smooth and gray (see Lane, vol. 4, 1441).

siqlātūn – Silk cloth interwoven or brocaded with threads of gold. The type woven in Baghdad was especially famous. Found throughout Europe during the medieval period (French and English: siglaton); also mentioned in several Geniza letters (see Dozy, vol. 1, 663; Gil, “References to Silk in Geniza Documents of the 11th Century,” 34).

sirwal – see sirwāl

sirwāl (pl. sarāwīl) – Trousers; drawers; breeches; underdrawers. From Old Persian zārawāro; modern Persian shalwār (see Dozy, Vet., 203-209; Lane, vol. 4, 1354-1355;).

ṣūf – Wool; camlet, a textile made goat hair, wool, and silk (see Dozy, vol. 1, 853; Lane, vol. 4, 1748).

takhftīja – A small or light turban; light clothing as in nightclothes (see Dozy, vol. 1, 385; Dozy, Vet., 160-162).

ṭurtūr – A high hat originally worn by Egyptian Bedouin; in cities placed on head of criminal or vanquished enemy; also worn by dervishes (see Dozy, vol. 2, 36; Dozy, Vet., 262-278; Lane, vol. 5, 1834-1835).

ṭawq – Collar of a garment; border, piping, or trim of a garment; a neck-ring, an ornament for the neck (see Dozy, vol. 2, 70-71; Lane, vol. 5, 1894-1895).

ṭaylasān – A certain article of apparel worn by Persians or other foreigners, of a round form and black; a sort of hood worn over the head and covering the shoulders (see Dozy, Vet., 278-280; Dozy, vol. 2, 53; Lane, vol. 5, 1866).

thawb – A general word for garment; an ample flowing robe woven of silk, sleeves equal in length to that of the garment, often rose or violet in color; clothes, garment, woman’s gown. When women wished to go out in public, this is the garment they wore over their clothes. A garment worn by men,
composed of linen, cotton, wool, fur, silk, etc. (see Dozy, vol. 1, 166; Dozy, Vet. 105-106; Lane, vol. 1, 362).

ṭirāz – From Persian terāz, “embroidery.” Came to denote any Islamic textile with an embroidered or woven inscription, as well as the caliphal workshops in which they were made (dar-al-ṭirāz). Some of these workshops worked only for the court, and others made ṭirāz for general sale (see Dozy, vol. 2, 35; Lane, vol. 5, 1840).

washī – Type of multicolored silk textile, sometimes brocaded with gold; variegated silk (see Dozy, vol. 2, 809; Lane, supplement, 74).

zarkāsh – An embroidery; gold and silver embroidery (see Dozy vol. 1, 589).
Persian-English Textile and Dress Glossary


jāmah – A garment, vestment, or robe (see Richardson, A Dictionary of Persian, Arabic, and English, vol. 1, 333; Han Rulin, “Yuandai zhama yan xin tan,” 248; Allsen, “Robing in the Mongolian Empire,” 305).

kamkhā- A lampas weave textile woven with metal, related to nasīj. In English, “camaca”, from Min nan (Fujian Chinese language) for golden flower: kimhoe (jinhua 金花) (see Coatsworth, et al, "Camaca").

khaftān – Persian cuirass (see Stillman, Arab Dress, 39).

kolāh – A tiara or hat denoting noble rank; a skullcap (see Rose, “Sasanian Splendor,” 37; Melikian-Chirvani, “Parand and Parniyān Identified,” 177).

rān – Leggings or puttees: “Strips of cloth wound around the lower leg from the ankle to the knees…among the Irano-Central Asian articles of clothing that Arab warriors were forbidden to wear during the early days of the Muslim empire.” (Stillman, Arab Dress, 39).

parand – A monochrome, or “decorated with only one color in combination with white” silk featuring roundels. (Melikian-Chirvani, “Parand and Parniyān Identified,” 1991, p. 175).

parneyān – A polychrome silk. “The Persian “royal silk par excellence, at least from the Sasanian period on…its distinctive feature is a pattern based on rows of roundels, called “wheels” in Persain, enclosing figural motifs or formal designs.” (Melikian-Chirvani, “Parand and Parniyān Identified,” 175).

qabā – A cloak; a garment; a short tunic open in front; a close long gown worn by men; a shirt (see Steingass, A Comprehensive Persian-English dictionary, 950; Melikian-Chirvani, “Parand and Parniyān Identified,” 177).

ṣalwar– Trousers; underdrawers; inner breeches; drawers reaching to the feet; from Old Persian zārawāro (see Steingass, A Comprehensive Persian-English dictionary, 758; Stillman, Arab Dress, 10; Baker, “Islamic Honorific Garments,” 28).

sarāparde – Royal tents (Melikian-Chirvani, “Parand and Parniyān Identified,” 177)
shalwâr – see šalwar
sholwâr – see šalwar


ṭerāz – The term ṭerāz originally comes from the Persian “to embroider,” ṭarāzīdan, but eventually it came to refer to garments ornamented with embroidered or woven inscriptions. Ṭerâz also refers to the places where such robes are made (dār ul-ṭeraz, ṭerâz “factories”) (see Steingass, *A Comprehensive Persian-English dictionary*, 811; Blair, *Islamic Inscriptions*, 165; Jonathan Bloom and Sheila Blair (eds.), *Grove Encyclopedia of Islamic Art and Architecture*, “Tiraz”).

yāaqūt – hyacinth (a precious red stone), used in the Yuan dynasty to adorn the emperor’s zhisun/jisūn robes (Steingass, p. 1437; “Precious stone or ruby,” Han Rulin, “Yuandai zhama yan xin tan,” 250-251; *WSWG* p. 138).

zandaniji – The word zandaniji comes from the name of a place, Zandana, in Central Asia, near Bukhara. While it was thought for much of the second half of the 20th century that zandaniji referred to silk samite-woven textiles decorated with animals in roundels, this material as produced in Central Asia was probably made of cotton. There are various Persian definitions of zandaniji, including, “a wide garment of white thread,” and “extremely coarse, tight, white, textile.” (see Frye, “Bukhara and Zandanijī,” 75, 77; Juvayni, *History of the World Conqueror*, 77).

zarbaft- “brocade.” The term used to describe the material of khan’s tent in Juvayni, probably referring to a textile woven with a gilded supplementary weft (Juvayni, *History of the World Conqueror*, 218).
ILLUSTRATIONS

1. The Steppe and the Central Plain: Uighur, Khitan, Jurchen, and Tangut Dress

Figure 1.1 Map showing the Tarim Basin in the mid-9th century (Whitfield and Sims-Williams, *The Silk Road: Trade, Travel, War and Faith* 10-11).

Figure 1.2 Map of Tang and Song Territories, 9th-12th centuries (Adler and Pouwels, *World Civilizations* 182).
Figure 1.3 Robe with bird roundels, silk samite, from Alar, Xinjiang c. 1131-1162 CE (Kuhn, *Chinese Silks*, fig 6.6b front).

Figure 1.4 Robe with roundels with confronted goats, silk samite, from Alar, Xinjiang c. 1131-1162 CE (Zhao Feng, Wang Le, and Wang Mingfang, “Tan Qinghai Ala’er chutude liang jian jin pao,” fig. 5, 69).
Figure 1.5 Liao samite caftan with roundel design, 11<sup>th</sup> century, Chris Hall Collection (CH 201) on loan to The Asian Civilizations Museum, Singapore (Wong Hwei and Szan Tan, *Power Dressing*, pl 10, 114-115).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 1 – Front Closing Robe</th>
<th>Category 2 – Side Closing Robe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gabain 1</td>
<td>Gabain 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Gabain 1" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Gabain 2" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabain 5</td>
<td>Gabain 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Gabain 5" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Gabain 3" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabain 6</td>
<td>Gabain 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Gabain 6" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Gabain 4" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabain 10</td>
<td>Gabain 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Gabain 10" /></td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Gabain 7" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1.6 Table showing von Gabain’s Uighur dress types divided into categories of front closing and side closing robe (After Gabain, figs. 6, 119, 122, 124, 125, 126, 127, 212).
Figure 1.7 Three male donors. Bezeklik cave 20, mid-9th-early 12th century, Xinjiang Province, China. Collection of SMB, Museum für Asiatische Kunst in Berlin [old numbering system, cave 9] (Le Coq, Chotscho, pl. 30).

Figure 1.8 Military official Tang (717) from Grave of Li Zhen, 112 cm x 27 cm, clay with painting and gilding, Zhaoling museum, Shaanxi (Stark, “Some Remarks on the Headgear of the Royal Turks,” fig. 4, p. 129).
Figure 1.9 Two female donors, Bezeklik cave 20 [old cave 9], mid-9th-early 12th century
Collection of SMB, Museum für Asiatische Kunst in Berlin (Le Coq, Chotscho, pl. 30).

Figure 1.10 Male donors, Bezeklik cave 41 (Jia Yingyi et al. Tulufan Bozikelike shiku,
fig. 101).
Figure 1.11 Line drawing of a female figure (Gabain, Figure 125).

Figure 1.12 Four male figures (Tocharian knights) from the Cave of the Sixteen Sword Bearers (cave 8, or Höhle der Sechzehn Schwetträger) now in the Museum für Indische Kunst in Berlin.
Figure 1.13 Merchants Banqueting, wall painting, c. 8th century, Pendjikent, Hermitage Museum, St. Petersburg (Chauvin, *Les arts de l’Asie central*, fig. 185).

Figure 1.14 Robe from North Caucasus conserved, front view. Caftan, Linen and silk, North Caucasus 8-10 century, Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1996.78.1 (Kajitani, “A Man’s Caftan and Leggings from the North Caucasus of the Eighth to Tenth Century,” fig. 1).
Figure 1.15 Robe from North Caucasus conserved in MMA, side and back views. Caftan, Linen and silk, North Caucasus 8-10th century, MMA 1996.78.1 (Kajitani, “A Man’s Caftan and Leggings from the North Caucasus of the Eighth to Tenth Century,” fig. 3).

Figure 1.16 Cover with floral designs. Samit (weft-faced compound twill), yellow and blue silk. Height: 200 cm; width: 114.5 cm. Liao period (radiocarbon dating 1027-1194 CE). Abegg-Stiftung, Riggisberg, inv. no. 5235 (Dragons of Silk, 146-147, cat. 1).
Figure 1.17 Fragment with coiled dragons. Red tabby silk with gold supplementary weft Liao dynasty (Radiocarbon dated to 720-1010 CE). Musée Guimet, AEDTA no. 3270 (photo by Eiren Shea).

Figure 1.18 Textile fragment with coiled dragons. Tabby with supplementary weft of gold strips. Jin dynasty (1115-1234). Warp: 74.5 cm; weft: 33.2 cm. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1989.205 (WSWG, 116-117, cat. 30).
Figure 1.19 Textile fragment embroidered with birds. *Liseré* ground with embroidery. Tang dynasty (c. 8th-9th century). Warp: 25.7 cm; weft: 157.5 cm. The Cleveland Museum of Art, 1994.96 (*WSWG*, 169, det. cat. 48)

Figure 1.20 Robe with embroidered phoenixes and flowers. Silk gauze, tabby, silk batting, and embroidery. Liao dynasty (907-1125). Length (collar to hem): 130 cm; width (across sleeves): 177 cm. The Cleveland Museum of Art, 1995.20 (*WSWG*, 176-179, cat. 51).
Figure 1.21 Embroidered pattern of dragons with a flaming pearl, silk and gold thread. Musée Guimet, AEDTA 3912 (Photo by Eiren Shea).

Figure 1.22 Kesi boots. Silk tapestry (kesi), h. 47.5 cm; width 30.8 cm. Liao dynasty (907-1124 CE). Cleveland Museum of Art, 1993.158, 158a (WSWG, 87, cat. 23).
Figure 1.23 Hu Gui 923-935 (Chinese) Liao, *Going Out on the Hunt*, before 937, 33 x 44.5 cm. National Palace Museum, Taipei (Lin Boting, *Da guan*, 264).

Figure 1.24 Hu Gui 923-935 (Chinese) Liao, *Returning from the Hunt* before 937, 34.2 x 47 cm. National Palace Museum, Taipei (Lin Boting, *Da guan*, 265).
Figure 1.25 Detail of mural representing tomb occupant. Tomb of Xu Xianxiu, Northern Qi, 571 CE, Datong, Shanxi. Discovered in early December, 2000 (Xu Guangji Zhongguo chu tu bi hua quan ji, vol. 2, 92).

Figure 1.26 Two rows of male donors, Bezeklik cave 16 [old cave 6], mid-9th-early 12th century, near Turfan, Xinjiang Province (Le Coq, Die Buddistische Spätantike in Mittelasien, vol. 3, pl. 14).
Figure 1.27 Detail from a hunting scene. Liao dynasty (907-1124 CE). Height: 84 cm, width: 73 cm. From a tomb in Dahabaqilacun, Beizifuzhen, Aohao Banner, Inner Mongolia (Xu Guangji, Zhongguo chu tu bi hua quan ji, vol. 3, 168).

Figure 1.28 Portrait of Song Taizu, second half of 10th century. Hanging scroll, ink and colors on silk. Height: 191 cm; width: 169.7 cm. National Palace Museum, Taipei (Lin Boting, Da guan, 221).
Figure 1.29 Portrait of Song Huizong, c. late 12th century. Hanging scroll, ink and colors on silk. Height: 188.2 cm; width: 106.7 cm. National Palace Museum, Taipei (Lin Boting, *Da guan*, 230).

Figure 1.30 Attributed to Yan Liben (c. 600-673), *Thirteen Emperors*, detail. Song dynasty copy (c. 11th century). Handscroll, ink and colors on silk. Height: 51.3; width: 531 cm. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 31.643 (Digital Scrolling Paintings Project, University of Chicago (https://scrolls.uchicago.edu/scroll/thirteen-emperors)).
Figure 1.31 Emperor Wu of Jin from *Thirteen Emperors*. Song dynasty copy (c. 11th century). Handscroll, ink and colors on silk Height: 51.3; width: 531 cm. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 31.643 (Digital Scrolling Paintings Project, University of Chicago (https://scrolls.uchicago.edu/scroll/thirteen-emperors)).
Figure 1.32 Emperor Wu of Northern Zhou from *Thirteen Emperors*. Song dynasty copy (c. 11\textsuperscript{th} century). Handscroll, ink and colors on silk Height: 51.3; width: 531 cm. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 31.643 (Digital Scrolling Paintings Project, University of Chicago (https://scrolls.uchicago.edu/scroll/thirteen-emperors).

Figure 1.33 Posthumous Portrait of Zhao Hongyin. Song dynasty (c. 11\textsuperscript{th} -12\textsuperscript{th} century). Hanging scroll, ink and colors on silk. National Palace Museum, Taipei (Wikimedia commons).
Fig. 1.34 Detail of *diexie* belt from the Princess of Chen Liao dynasty tomb (1018). Gold and silver on leather, l. 156 cm; w. 3 cm (Zhu Qixin, “The Liao Dynasty Tomb of Prince and Princess of the Chen Kingdom,” fig 16).

Figure 1.35 Portrait of the consort of Emperor Renzong, Empress Cao (1016-1079). Northern Song dynasty (c. 11th century). Hanging scroll, ink and colors on silk, h. 172.1, w. 165.3. National Place Museum, Taipei (Lin Boting, *Da guan*, 233).
Fig. 1.36 Portrait of the consort of Emperor Ningzong, Empress Gongsheng (1162-1232), detail. Southern Song dynasty (c. 12th century). Hanging scroll, ink and colors on silk, h. 189.5 cm, w. 110.2 cm. National Place Museum, Taipei (Toyka-Fuong, *Schatze der Himmelssohne*, pl. 81).

Figure 1.37 Hat from the tomb of the King of Qi. Plain blue silk *luo* with gold decoration, green jade openwork ornament (Zhu Qixin, “Royal Costumes of the Jin Dynasty,” fig. 2).
Figure 1.38 *Lady Wenji Returns to Han*, detail. Handscroll, ink and colors on silk. Jilin Provincial Museum (Wikimedia commons).

Figure 1.39 *Swan Hunt*, Jin dynasty (1115-1234). Plain-weave silk brocaded with metallic thread, warp 58.5 cm, weft 62.2 cm. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1989.282 (*WSWG*, cat. 28).
Figure 1.40 Hunting Robe. Blue silk with patterns of deer in a forest in gold supplementary weft. Jin Dynasty (1115-1234). Length (collar to hem): 126 cm; width (across sleeves): 240 cm. Chris Hall Collection, Hong Kong (Photo courtesy of Chris Hall).

Figure 1.41 Detail of inscription on Hunting Robe. Blue silk with patterns of deer in a forest in gold supplementary weft. Jin Dynasty (1115-1234), Chris Hall Collection, Hong Kong. (Photo by Eiren Shea)
Figure 1.42 Dark brown tabby weave robe with decorative bands woven in gold. Tabby weave ground, pattern in four-end weft-faced twill gold thread. Jin dynasty, 1162 CE. Length: 140 cm; width (across sleeves): 221 cm. Excavated in 1988 from the tomb of the Prince of Qi, Acheng. Heilongjiang, Helongjiang Provincial Museum, Harbin (Kuhn, *Chinese Silks*, Figure 6.24a)
Figure 1.43 Map showing territory of Tangut state 1038-1227 (Fisher Fine Arts Image Collection, University of Pennsylvania).

Figure 1.44 detail of entertainers, Guanyin, Moon in Water Tangut (12th century). Scroll on silk, 101.5x59.5 cm. The State Hermitage Museum (Piotrovsky, Lost Empire of the Silk Road, pl. 46).
Figure 1.45 detail of donor, *Guanyin, Moon in Water*, Tangut (12th century). Scroll on silk, 101.5x59.5 cm. The State Hermitage Museum Piotrovsky, *Lost Empire of the Silk Road*, pl. 46).

Figure 1.46 Detail of official and servant, Tangut (12th century). Woodblock print, 45 x 20.3 cm. The State Hermitage Museum (Piotrovsky, *Lost Empire of the Silk Road*, pl. 63).
Figure 1.47 Donor portrait, detail. Cave 409, Dunhuang, Tangut period (1032-1227) (Shi Jinbo, “Xixia xingshi he Dunhuang Mogao ku chuyi,” (Whitfield, Cave temples of Mogao, 29).

Figure 1.48 Xixia Translating Sutras, National Library in Beijing, excavated Khara Khoto (Chen and Xu, Zhongguo fushi tongshi, 383, fig. 8-35).
Figure 1.49 Portrait of Tangut Emperor. Excavated from Khara khotokh (Piotrovsky, *Lost Empire of the Silk Road*, fig. 67).

Figure 1.50 detail of donors, Amitabha Appearing before Worshippers. Tangut (12th century). Scroll on silk, h. 125 cm, w. 65 cm. The State Hermitage Museum (Piotrovsky, *Lost Empire of the Silk Road*, pl. 38, p. 180).
Figure 1.51 Usnisavijaya Mandala male donor. Tangut (12th-early 13th centuries). Painting on wood, h. 130, w. 108 cm. The State Hermitage Museum (Piotrovsky, *Lost Empire of the Silk Road*, pl. 20, p. 142).

Figure 1.52 Greeting the Soul of the Righteous Man on the Way to the Pure Land of Amitabha, male donor. Tangut (late 12th century). Scroll on linen, h. 84.8cm, w. 63.8 cm. The State Hermitage Museum (Piotrovsky, *Lost Empire of the Silk Road*, pl. 41, p 186).
Figure 1.53 Usnisavijaya Mandala, detail of female donor. Tangut (12th-early 13th centuries). Painting on wood, h. 111, w. 131 cm. The State Hermitage Museum (Piotrovsky, *Lost Empire of the Silk Road*, pl. 21, p. 143).

Figure 1.54 Female donors from a painting of Guanyin. Tangut (12th century). Scroll on silk, h. 97.5cm, w. 59 cm. The State Hermitage Museum (Piotrovsky, *Lost Empire of the Silk Road*, pl. 49, p. 206).
2. Early Mongol Dress (1206-1259)

Figure 2.1 Textile fragment with felines and eagles. Lampas weave. Warp: 170.5 cm; weft: 109 cm. Eastern Iranian world, mid-13th century. The Cleveland Museum of Art. Purchase from the J.H. Wade Fund, 1990.2 (WSWG cat. 43, 154-155).
Figure 2.2 Two lampas-woven textile fragments. Silk and gilded lamella of animal substrate, both spun around a silk core and woven flat. Eastern Islamic area, mid-13th century. David Collection, Copenhagen, 4/1993, 15/1989 (photo by Pernille Klemp, David Collection).
Figure 2.3 Fragment of a lampas-woven textile. Silk and gilded lamella of animal substrate both spun around a silk core and woven flat. Eastern Islamic area, mid-13th century. Warp: 113cm; weft: 32 cm. David Collection, Copenhagen, 14/1992 (photo by Pernille Klemp, David Collection).
Figure 2.4 Textile fragment with reclining *djeiran* in teardrop shape. Tabby with supplementary weft of gold strips. Mingshui, 13th century. Warp: 21 cm, weft: 43 cm. Inner Mongolia Institute of Archaeology, Hohhot (Zhao, *Treasures in Silk*, cat. 5.08, 172-3).

Figure 2.5 Textile fragment with *makara* roundel. Tabby with supplementary weft of gold strips. Mingshui, early 13th century. Diameter of roundel: 27-28 cm. Inner Mongolia Institute of Archaeology, Hohhot (Zhao, *Treasures in Silk*, cat. 6.08, 201).
Figure 2.6 Textile fragment with *djeiran*, floral branches and moon. Red silk tabby with supplementary weft of gold strips. Jin dynasty (1115-1234). Warp: 109.8 cm; weft: 38.5 cm. Cleveland Museum of Art, purchase from the J.H. Wade Fund, 1991.4 (*WSWG* cat. 29, 114-115).

Figure 2.7 Textile fragment with reclining *djeiran*, floral branches, clouds, and moon. Yellow silk tabby brocaded with gilded strips, Jin dynasty (1115-1234). Warp: 50.5 cm; weft: 61.5 cm. Musée Guimet, AEDTA 3430 (photo by Eiren Shea).
Figure 2.8 Textile Fragment with *makaras*, phoenixes, and flowers. Lampas weave (*nasīj*). Central Asia or Dadu, Mongol period (13th century). Warp: 51.3 cm; weft: 75.6 cm. Cleveland Museum of Art, Purchase from the J.H. Wade Fund, 1991.5 a,b (*WSWG* cat. 41, 152).

Figure 2.9 Two fragments with phoenixes and *makaras*. Lampas weave, silk with supplementary weft of gilded lamella on paper, spun around a silk core. Central Asia or Dadu, Mongol period (13th century). Fragment a: warp: 17 cm; weft: 75 cm; fragment b: warp: 16.5 cm; weft: 75 cm. David Collection, Copenhagen, 46 a-b/1992 (Folsach and Bernsted *Woven Treasures*, cat. 18, 54; 102)
Figure 2.10 Textile fragment with confronted birds in palmettes. Blue silk tabby with supplementary weft of gold strips. North China, Mongol period (13th –mid-14th century). Total dimensions: warp: 58 cm; weft: 63 cm; pattern dimensions: height (warp): 17 cm, width (weft): 14 cm. Musée Guimet, AEDTA 3262 (photo by Eiren Shea).

Figure 2.11 Textile fragment with scrolling motifs in palmettes. Green silk tabby with supplementary weft of gold strips. Mongol period (13th – mid-14th century). Total dimensions: warp: 41 cm; weft: 61.5 cm; pattern dimensions: height (warp): 17 cm, width (weft): 13.5/14 cm. Musée Guimet, AEDTA 3747 (photo by Eiren Shea).
Figure 2.12 Textile fragment with floral motifs in palmettes. Red silk tabby with supplementary weft of gold strips. Mongol period (13th-mid-14th century). Total dimensions: warp: 98/102 cm; weft: 34 cm; pattern dimensions: height (warp): 13-15 cm, width (weft): 12.5 cm. Musée Guimet, AEDTA 3380 (photo by Eiren Shea).

Figure 2.14 Detail of phoenixes among clouds. Blue tabby silk with supplementary pattern weft in gold lamella on animal substrate. China, Jin dynasty (12th-13th century). Warp: 60.5 cm; weft: 63 cm. Musée Guimet, AEDTA 3086 (photo by Eiren Shea).

Figure 2.16 Boot cover with pattern of flowers on purple background. *Kesi* with lampas border. Excavated from the tombs of the Wanggu clan, Mingshui Damaoqi, Inner Mongolia. Mongol Period (early 13th century). Warp: 45 cm, weft: 26 cm. Inner Mongolia Museum, Hohhot (Zhao, *Treasures in Silk*, cat. 5.04, 165).

Figure 2.17 *Kesi* fragment on blue background. Red, green, purple, light blue silk; gold threads. China, 13th century (found in Tibet). Warp: 106 cm; weft: 42.5 cm. Musée Guimet, AEDTA 3365 (photo by Eiren Shea).
Figure 2.18 Fragment with repeat motif of coiled dragons. Tabby weave with a double warp. Purple silk and gilded lamella of animal substrate. Warp: 37.5 cm; weft: 61 cm. Musée Guimet, AEDTA 3746 (photo by Eiren Shea).

Figure 2.19 Fragment with repeat motif of rabbits. Tabby weave with a double warp. Red and purple silk; gilded lamella of animal substrate. Jin dynasty (Carbon dated 1240-1400). Warp: 59 cm; weft: 31 cm. Musée Guimet, AEDTA 3269 (photo by Eiren Shea).
Figure 2.20 Textile fragment with dragons and partial cloud-collar medallion. *Kesi.* Central Asia, 13th century (or earlier). Warp: 59.7 cm; weft: 31.1 cm. Chris Hall Collection, Hong Kong (*WSWG*, fig. 26, 75).

Figure 2.21 Female robe with cloud collar pattern and wide sleeves, silk twill brocade. Warp: 163 cm, weft: 206 cm, Private collection (Zhao, *Gold Silk Blue and White*, pl. 31).
Figure 2.22 Textile fragment showing lions with palmettes. *Kesi*. Central Asia, Mongol period (13th century or earlier). Warp: 63.5 cm; weft: 34.7 cm. The Cleveland Museum of Art, purchase from the J.H. Wade Fund, 1991.3 (*WSWG* cat. 19, 80-81).

Figure 2.23 Musée Guimet AEDTA 3277. Warp: 10.5 cm; weft: 21 cm. Black silk background, orange, green blue, white, green, grey silk and gold thread decoration (photo by Eiren Shea).
Figure 2.24 Sasanian architectural design of palmette. Stucco roundel. Sassanian (6th century). 62.2 cm. Metropolitan Museum of Art, Rogers Fund, 32.150.1 (Metropolitan Museum of Art Collection Online).

Figure 2.25 Folio from a Quran manuscript with palmette decorations. Ink and gold on parchment. Central or Eastern Islamic lands, first half of 10th c. Height 13 cm; width 10.5 cm. Metropolitan Museum of Art, Rogers Fund, 37.30 (Metropolitan Museum of Art Collection Online).
Figure 2.26 Three textile fragments with elephant, stupa, lotus, lion, and Chinese characters (連，獅，華，白，右). Silk, possibly weft-faced compound tabby weave (taqueté). Northern China, 5th-6th century. Chris Hall Collection, Hong Kong (photo by Eiren Shea).

Figure 2.27 Lustre painted bowl with lion and kufic script. Egypt, Fatimid period (12th century). Kuwait National Museum LNS 167 C, al-Sabah collection (Fisher Fine Arts Image Collection, University of Pennsylvania).
Figure 2.28 Cloth of Gold with Winged Lions and Griffins. Lampas, grey and coral silk, supplementary weft of gold strips on paper substrate. Warp: 124 cm; weft: 48.8 cm. Central Asia (mid-13th century). Cleveland Museum of Art, 1989.50 (*WSWG*, cat. 35).

Figure 2.29 Detail of confronted lions from the *bianxian* (“braided waist”) robe. Silk and metallic thread lampas with silk and metallic thread samite underflap. Excavated from the tombs of the Wanggu clan, Mingshui Damaqi, Inner Mongolia. Mongol Period (early 13th century). Length (collar to hem): 142 cm; width (across sleeves): 246 cm. Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region Museum, Hohhot (Zhao Feng, *Treasures in Silk*, 193, fig. 6.04).
Figure 2.30 Textile fragment with pseudo-kufic script. Silk compound tabby with supplementary weft of gold strips. Excavated from the tombs of the Wanggu clan, Mingshui Damaoji, Inner Mongolia. Mongol Period (early 13th century). Warp: 37 cm; weft: 45 cm. Inner Mongolia Institute of Archaeology, Hohhot (Zhao, *Chinese Silks*, Figure 7.12a, b, 342).

Figure 2.31 Detail of textile fragment with birds in roundels. Silk and metallic thread lampas. Beijing, Yuan Dynasty (13th-mid-14th century). Length: 23.6 cm; width: 17.5 cm. China National Silk Museum, Hangzhou, 3217 (photo by Eiren Shea).
Figure 2.32 Left half of a lampas-woven textile. Silk, gilded paper, and gilded animal substrate. China or the eastern Islamic world, Mongol period (1st half of 14th century). Warp: 228 cm; weft: 63.5 cm. David Collection, Copenhagen, 40/1997 (photo by Pernille Klemp, David Collection).

Figure 2.33 Detail of pseudo-inscription from a fragment of a lampas-woven textile. Eastern Islamic area, mid-13th century. David Collection, Copenhagen, 14/1992 (photo by Pernille Klemp, David Collection).
Figure 2.34 Detail of pseudo-inscription from a lampas-woven caftan. Eastern Islamic world or China, 1st half of the 14th century. David Collection, Copenhagen, 23/2004 (photo by Pernille Klemp, David Collection).

Figure 2.35 Drawing of pseudo-inscription on the nasīj braided-waist robe. Rossi and Rossi Collection, London (drawing by Eiren Shea).
Figure 2.36 Pseudo-inscription (top of photo) from a lampas-woven (nasīj) robe. Silk and metallic threads. China or Central Asia, Mongol Period (13th-mid-14th century). Chris Hall Collection, Hong Kong.

Figure 2.37 Inscription h, Comares Hall, Alahambra Palace, Granada, Spain (Puerta Vilchez, *Reading the Alhambra*, 127-128).
Figure 2.38 A blue-glazed alif-lam knot. Ilkhanid period (13th-14th centuries). The Louvre Museum, Paris, MAO 2010 (photo by Eiren Shea).

Figure 2.39 A frieze with a Quranic inscription with the tops of the letters forming a decorative knot. Ilkhanid period (13th-14th centuries). Musée des Arts Décoratifs, Paris AD7 642 (photo by Eiren Shea).
Figure 2.40 Textile fragment, inscribed with name of Abu Bakr, ruler of Fars (r. 1226-1260). Lampas weave, silk and gilded lamella of animal substrate, both spun around a silk core and woven flat. Eastern Islamic area, mid-13th century (c. 1260). Warp: 66.5 cm; weft: 41 cm. David Collection, Copenhagen, 20/1994 (photo by Pernille Klemp).

Figure 2.41 Silk and gold ṭirāz in the name of the Ilkhanid Abu Sa'id. Western Iran, 1319-1335. Dom und Dīozensanmuseum, Vienna (Folsach, “A Set of Silk Panel from the Mongol Period,” Fig. 225)
Figure 2.42 Silk and gold ṭirāz naming Nasir al-Din Muhammad (71x22 cm), Central Asia, first half of the 14th century. Museum für Kunst und Kulturgeschichte der Hansestadt, Lübeck, TE.40 (Folsach, “A Set of Silk Panel from the Mongol Period,” fig. 226).

Figure 2.43 Bianxian (“braided waist”) robe. Silk and metallic thread lampas with silk and metallic thread samite underflap. Excavated from the tombs of the Wanggu clan, Mingshui Damaqi, Inner Mongolia. Mongol Period (early 13th century). Length (collar to hem): 142 cm; width (across sleeves): 246 cm. Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region Museum, Hohhot (The World of Khubilai Khan, 74, fig. 102).
Figure 2.44 Lampas-woven (*nasi*) robe. Silk and metallic threads. China or Central Asia, Mongol Period (13th-mid-14th century). Length (collar to hem): 128.5 cm; width (sleeve to sleeve): 189 cm. Chris Hall Collection, Hong Kong (courtesy of Chris Hall).
Figure 2.45 Caftan sewn from a lampas-woven textile. Silk with gilded lamella of animal substrate. Eastern Islamic world or China, 1st half of the 14th century. Length (collar to hem): 130 cm; width (sleeve to sleeve): 195 cm. David Collection, Copenhagen, 23/2004 (Perinille Klemp, David Collection).
Figure 2.46 Bianxian (“braided waist”) robe. Silk and metallic thread lampas (*nasīf*). China or Central Asia, Mongol Period (13th-mid-14th century). Length (collar to hem): 123 cm; width (sleeve to sleeve): 202 cm. Rossi and Rossi, London (Zhao Feng, *Gold Silk Blue and White*, pl. 28).
Figure 2.47 Robe with ribboned waist decoration. Twill damask. China (?), Mongol Period (13th-mid-14th century). Length (collar to hem): 126 cm; width (sleeve to sleeve): 218 cm. Rossi and Rossi, London (Zhao Feng, *Gold Silk Blue and White*, pl. 32)
Figure 2.48 Bianxian (“braided waist”) robe. Silk tabby with supplementary wefts of gilt thread. China, Mongol period (13th-mid-14th century). Length (collar to hem): 202 cm; width: (sleeve to sleeve): 117 cm. China National Silk Museum, Hangzhou (*Du ciel à la terre*, cat. 38).
Figure 2.49 Anon., *Hunting Geese (sheyan tu 射雁圖)*. Yuan dynasty (14th century). Hanging scroll, ink and colors on silk. Length (collar to hem): 131.8 cm; width: 93.9 cm. National Palace Museum, Taipei (*Da Han de shiji*, pl. 1-13).

Figure 2.50 Illustration of a Mongol archer, *Shilin guangji* (Chen Yuanjing *Xutiao siku quanshu*, vol. 1218, 387).
Figure 2.51 Belt of King of the state of Qi. Silk and gold threads. Jin dynasty (12th century), unearthed in 1988 outside Chiengzicun, in Juyuan county in Heilongjiang province (Zhu Qixin “Royal Costumes of the Jin Dynasty,” fig. 6, 62).

Figure 2.52 Painting of tomb occupants, north, northeast, and northwest walls. Yuan dynasty (1269), excavated in 1998 from the Dongercun (洞耳村) tomb, Pucheng (蒲城) county, Shaanxi (Kaogu yu wenwu, no. 1, 2000).
Figure 2.53 Painting of tomb occupants, north wall, Yuan dynasty (c. 1279-1368), excavated from the Sanyanjing tomb, Chifeng, Inner Mongolia (Xu Guangji, zhongguo chu tu bi hua quan ji, vol. 3, fig. 222).

Figure 2.54 Detail of maids serving tea, wall mural. tomb M2 at Kangzhuangcun, Shanxi. 13th Year of Zhiyuan Era (1276 CE), Yuan dynasty. Height: c. 159 cm; width: c. 146 cm. Preserved in the Changzhi Museum, China (Xu Guangji, zhongguo chu tu bi hua quan ji, vol. 2, fig. 194).
Figure 2.55 Enthronement scene. Illustration from the Diez Albums, Iran (possibly Tabriz), early 14th century. Ink and colors on paper. Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin (Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Orientabteilung, Diez fol. 70, S. 10).

Figure 2.56 Yuan female robe with *nasīj* border and wide sleeves. Metallic thread lampas (*nasīj*) and twill. Length: 228 cm; width: 165.5 cm, Private collection (Zhao Feng, *Gold Silk Blue and White*, pl. 30).
Figure 2.57 Front closing Uighur dress, line drawing (Gabain, Das Leben im uigurischen Königreich von Qoco, fig. 123).

Figure 2.58 Line drawing of a Uighur woman wearing a boqta (Gabain, Das Leben im uigurischen Königreich von Qoco, fig. 124).
Figure 2.59 Anige, *Portrait of Chabi*, 1294. Album leaf, ink and colors on silk. Height: 61.5 cm; width: 48 cm. National Palace Museum, Taipei (Wikimedia commons).

Figure 2.60 Ornament from a *boqta* headdress. Gold and carnelian, Excavated in 2001 from a Yuan tomb near the Eng’er River, Xilin Gol League, Inner Mongolia. Height: 6.1 cm; width: 6 cm. Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region Museum (*The World of Khubilai Khan*, 82, fig. 114).
Figure 2.61 Boqta (gugu) headdress. Embroidery, silk and metallic thread lampas (nasīj), and knots. China or Central Asia, Mongol period (13th–mid-14th century). Height: 38 cm. Private collection (Zhao Feng, Gold Silk Blue and White, 66).
Figure 2.62 Covering for a *boqta* (*gugu*) headdress. Gugu boqta, silk and metallic thread lampas (*nasīj*). China or Central Asia, Mongol period (13th-mid-14th century). China National Silk Museum, Hangzhou (photo by Eiren Shea).
3. Yuan Dynasty Court Dress (1260-1368)

Figure 3.1 Anige, *Portrait of Khubilai*. 1294, Yuan dynasty. Album leaf, colors and ink on silk. Height: 59.1; width: 47.6 cm. National Palace Museum, Taipei (*The World of Khubilai Khan*, 4, fig. 1)

Figure 3.2 Blue tabby silk fragment with a repeat pattern of dragons in gilded supplementary weft in palmettes. Yuan dynasty (c. 1271-1368). Warp: 31cm; weft: 57cm Chris Hall Collection, Hong Kong (photo by Eiren Shea).
Figure 3.3 Drawing of a robe with badge with design of falcon chasing a hare. Gold brocaded lampas on silk twill damask. Height: 140; width (sleeves): 222 cm. Private Collection, China (drawing by Eiren Shea).
Figure 3.4 Liu Guandao (active c. 1275-1300). *Khubilai Khan Hunting*, dated 1280. Hanging scroll, ink and color on silk. 182.9 cm x 104.1 cm. National Palace Museum, Taipei (Wikimedia commons).
Figure 3.5 Anonymous. *Judging Horses*, detail. Yuan Dynasty (1271-1368). Ink and color on silk, 27.0 cm x 211.8 cm. Jilin Provincial Museum (*Yuan hua quan ji*, vol. 3, part 2, fig. 65).

Figure 3.6 Detail of Emperors Tugh Têmur and Khoshila from from *Mandala of Yamantaka-Vajrabhairava*, c. 1330-1332. Silk tapestry (*kesi*). Warp: 245.5 cm; weft: 208.9 cm. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1992.54 (Metropolitan Museum of Art Online Collection).
Figure 3.7 Detail of Khubilai Khan from *Khubilai Khan Hunting*

Figure 3.8 Detail of attendant with *xiongbei* from *Khubilai Khan Hunting*
Figure 3.9 Detail of archer wearing robe with underarm openings from *Khubilai Khan Hunting*.

Figure 3.10 Detail of attendant wearing robe with underarm openings from *Khubilai Khan Hunting*.
Figure 3.11 Detail of Chabi wearing robe with underarm openings from *Khubilai Khan Hunting*

Figure 3.12 Robe with underarm openings. Silk with supplementary weft of lamella of animal substrate formally gilded. Yuan dynasty (1271-1368). China National Silk Museum, Hangzhou (photo by Eiren Shea).
Figure 3.13 Robe with underarm openings. Yuan dynasty (1271-1368). Twill damask with couched appliquéd. Length: 119 cm; width: 224 cm. Collection of Rossi and Rossi, Ltd. (Zhao Feng, *Gold Silk Blue and White*, 52-53, cat. 27).
Figure 3.14 Pair of Men. White pottery with “straw-colored” glaze pigments, height 19.5 cm, Tang dynasty, c. 8th-9th century (Baker, *Appeasing the spirits*, fig. 18).

Figure 3.15 Drawing of caftan with underarm openings, Central Asia, 9th-10th century. Silk samite. Abegg-Stiftung inv. no. 5357 (drawing by Eiren Shea).
Figure 3.16 Mural showing tomb occupants. Height: 70 cm; width: 210 cm. Yuan at tomb Houdesheng in Guoxiaoyaoxiang, Liangzhengxian, Inner Mongolia. Unearthed 1990. Preserved in the Inner Mongolia Museum, Hohhot (Xu Guangji, Zhongguo chu tu bi hua quan ji, vol. 3, fig. 226).

Figure 3.17 Mural showing a servant figure. Height: 71 cm; width: 50 cm. Yuan tomb at Zhoumacun in Changzhi, Shanxi. Yuan Dynasty, 11th year of Dade (1307 CE). Not preserved (Xu Guangji, Zhongguo chu tu bi hua quan ji, vol. 2, fig. 205).
Figure 3.18 Mural showing tomb occupant couple seated beside table. Height: c. 70 cm. Yuan tomb at the Smelting Plant in Iron and Steel, Xingtai, Hebei. Yuan dynasty (1271-1368). Not preserved (Xu Guangji, *Zhongguo chu tu bi hua quan ji*, vol. 1, fig. 201).

Figure 3.19 Detail of musician figure. Yuan tomb in Xilizhuang, Yuncheng, Shanxi dated after 1310. Preserved in the Institute of Archaeology in Shanxi (Xu Guangji, *Zhongguo chu tu bi hua quan ji*, fig. 210).
Figure 3.20 Zhao Mengfu, *Groom and Horse*, Yuan Dynasty, 1296. Handscroll, ink and color on paper. Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1988.135 (The Metropolitan Museum of Art Online Collection).

Figure 3.21 Door guard, 9th Year of Da'an Era, Liao (1093 CE), height 100 cm, width 40 cm. Unearthed from Zhang Kuangzheng's tomb (M10) at Xibali in Xuanhua, Hebei, preserved on original site (Xu Guangji, *Zhongguo chu tu bi hua quan ji*, fig. 139).
Figure 3.22 Tomb Occupants Seated at Table (Replica). Jin to Yuan dynasty (c. 12th-13th centuries), height c. 80 cm, width c. 120. Unearthed from tomb M2 at Shizhuangcun in Jinxing, Hebei. Preserved in the Cultural Relics Institute Hebei Province (Xu Guangji, Zhongguo chu tu bi hua quan ji, vol. 1, fig. 187).

Figure 3.23 Standing attendant figure in the Yuan tomb at Wangshangcun in Dengfeng, Henan currently in the Zhengzhou Municipal Institute of Cultural Relics and Archaeology (Xu Guangji, Zhongguo chu tu bi hua quan ji, vol. 5, fig. 192).
Figure 3.24 Jade belt hook, from tombs of Wang Shixian clan, Gansu (“Gansu Zhangxian Yuandai Wang Shixian jiazu muzang,” Wenwu 2, 1982, pl. 2).

Figure 3.25 Figures serving wine. Excavated from the Qilu hotel, Yuan tomb (13th-14th centuries), northern foot of Qianfoshan in Jinan, Shandong. Preserved in Jinan Museum (Xu Guangji, Zhongguo chu tu bi hua quan ji, vol. 4, fig. 187).
Figure 3.26 Detail of male figure from a tomb occupant couple. Yuan tomb (13\textsuperscript{th}-14\textsuperscript{th} centuries) at Xingcun in Ganggouxhen, Licheng district, Jinan, Shandong (Xu Guangji, \textit{Zhongguo chu tu bi hua quan ji}, vol. 4, fig 176).

Figure 3.27 Excavated hat from the Wang Shixian clan tombs. Yuan dynasty, 13\textsuperscript{th} century ("Gansu Zhangxian Yuandai Wang Shixian jiazu muzang," \textit{Wenwu} 2 (1982), pl. 1).
Figure 3.28 Hat, *nasīj* lampas. Yuan dynasty, 13th-14th centuries. Height 33 cm, width 46.5 cm. Collection of Rossi & Rossi Ltd. (Zhao Feng, *Gold, Silk, Blue and White*, fig. 38).

Figure 3.29 Hood with confronted falcons. Yuan dynasty, 13th-14th centuries. Excavated from Mingshui, Damaoqi, Inner Mongolia. Collection of Inner Mongolian Museum, Hohhot (Zhao Feng, *Gold, Silk, Blue and White*, fig. 39).
Figure 3.30 Detail of green twill silk fragment with printed design in gold of a recumbent stag. 13th century. Warp: 14cm; weft: 25cm. Chris Hall Collection, Hong Kong (photo by Eiren Shea).
Figure 3.31 Woman’s jacket (back and front) with pattern of lotus pond and other vignettes. Silk embroidery on silk gauze. 58.1 x 107 cm. Excavated from Jininglu Ancient City (dated 1312), Chayouqian Banner, Wulanchhabu, Inner Mongolia, 1976. Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region Museum (The World of Khubilai Khan, 81, fig. 113)
Figure 3.32 Examples of female dress. Excavated from the Yuan tomb of Li Yu’an, dated 1350. Zou county, Shandong Province (“Zouxian Yuandai Li Yu’an mu qingli jianbao” “邹县元代李裕庵墓清理简报” (Summary report on the excavation of the Yuan tomb of Li Yu’an in Zou county), *Wenwu* 4 (1978), fig. 21).

Figure 3.33 Yuan sleeveless garment with “turtle back” (hexagonal) roundel background and brocaded flowers. Length: 68 cm; width: 49 cm; flower roundels diameter: 18 cm (including border around them); 14 cm (without border). Excavated in Qinghai. China National Silk Museum, Hangzhou, no. 2677 (photo by Eiren Shea).
Figure 3.34 Maid lighting a lamp. 10th Year of Dade Era, Yuan dynasty (1306 CE). Height: c. 110 cm; width: c. 50 cm. From tomb M1 Kangzhuangcun, Tunliu, Shanxi. Preserved in Changzhi Museum (Xu, Guangji, *Zhongguo chu tu bi hua quan ji*, vol. 2, fig 200).

Figure 3.35 Yuan dynasty shoe cover with pattern of embroidered flowers and plants, Beijing (元代環繡花卉紋緞鞋面). Length: 26 cm, width: 20 cm. China National Silk Museum, Hangzhou, no. 3238 (photo by Eiren Shea).
Figure 3.36 Yuan dynasty satin shoe covers with polychrome embroidered patterns of flowers and plants, Beijing. Length: 18 cm, width: 6.5cm. China National Silk Museum, Hangzhou, no. 3239 (photo by Eiren Shea).

Figure 3.37 *Illustration of the Imperial Guard of Honor* (*Lubu tu* 隆武圖), detail. Northern Song dynasty (960-1127). Ink and color on silk, 14.8 m x 51.4 cm, Museum of Chinese History, Beijing (Wikimedia commons).
4. Ilkhanid Court Dress (1259-1353)

Figure 4.1 Map of Mongol Territories after 1260, from the exhibition “The Legacy of Genghis Khan,” Los Angeles County Museum of Art (LACMA http://www.lacma.org/khan/map.htm Accessed March 30, 2014)
Figure 4.2 *Iskandar Builds the Iron Rampart* (detail), from the *Shahnama*. Iran, Tabriz, Ilkhanid period c 1330-1336. Opaque watercolor, ink, and gold on paper, Sackler Gallery S1986.104 (Freer-Sackler website: http://www.asia.si.edu/explore/shahnama/S1986.104.asp)
Figure 4.3 *Ardashir captures Ardavan* (detail), from the *Shahnama*. Iran, Tabriz, Ilkhanid period, c 1330-1336. Opaque watercolor, ink, and gold on paper, Sackler Gallery S1986.103 (Freer-Sackler website: http://www.asia.si.edu/explore/shahnama/ardashirArdavan.asp).
Figure 4.4 *Taynush before Iskandar and The Visit to the Brahmans* (detail), from the *Shahnama*. Iran, Tabriz, Ilkhanid period, c. 1330-1336. Opaque watercolor, ink, and gold on paper, 15.1 x 28.6 cm, Sackler Gallery S1986.105 (Freer-Sackler website: [http://www.asia.si.edu/explore/shahnama/iskandar.asp](http://www.asia.si.edu/explore/shahnama/iskandar.asp)).

Figure 4.5 *Afrasiyab takes Siyavush as Prisoner* (detail), from the *Shahnama*. Iran, Tabriz, Ilkhanid period c. 1330-1336. Opaque watercolor, ink, and gold on paper. Freer Gallery of Art and Sackler Gallery F1931.21 (Smithsonian Learning Lab website: [https://learninglab.si.edu/resources/view/178049](https://learninglab.si.edu/resources/view/178049)).
Figure 4.6 *Enthronement of Shah Zav* (detail of kneeling figure), from the *Shahnama*. Iran, Tabriz, Ilkhanid period, c. 1330-1340. Ink, opaque watercolor, and gold on paper. H: 59.1, W: 40 cm. Sackler Gallery, S1989.107 (Smithsonian Learning Lab website: https://learninglab.si.edu/resources/view/456031).
Figure 4.7 Detail of dalmatic with patterns of stags and pelicans, lampas, silk and gold thread, Iran, 14th century. Length: 171.5 cm. Victoria and Albert Museum, London, no. 8361-1863 (photo by Eiren Shea).

Figure 4.8 Chasuble, lampas weave, silk and gold thread. Victoria and Albert Museum, London 594-1884 (Wardwell, *Panni Tartarici*, fig 62).

Figure 4.10 Velvet with gold disks. Silk, gilt-metal thread; brocaded velvet. Ilkhanid period, c. 1300. Cleveland Museum of Art, Dudley P. Allen Fund, 1918.225 (photo by Eiren Shea)
Figure 4.11 Front (left) and back (right) of velvet patterned with gold disks. Silk and gilt-metal thread. Ilkhanid period, 13th-14th century. Warp: 21 cm; weft: 15 cm; disk diameter: 1.2 cm. Cooper-Hewitt, National Design Museum, Smithsonian Institution, New York, 1902-1-385 (Sonday, “A Group of Possibly Thirteenth-Century Velvets with Gold Disks in Offset Rows,” fig. 1).

Figure 4.12 Velvet patterned with gold disks (detail). Silk and gilt-metal thread. Ilkhanid period (?). Disk diameter: 1.4 cm. Koninklijke Musea voor Kunst en Geschiedenis, Brussels, TX 464 (Sonday, “A Group of Possibly Thirteenth-Century Velvets with Gold Disks in Offset Rows,” fig. 3).
Figure 4.13 Six fragments of a gold fabric with scrolls, phoenixes, and peacocks. Persia, 13\textsuperscript{th}-14\textsuperscript{th} century. Abegg-Stiftung, Riggisberg, inv. no. 1705 a-f (Otavsky and Wardwell, *Mittelalterliche Textilien II*, 330).
Figure 4.15 Textile Fragment (Pattern woven silk with gilt and silvered tanned leather), Central Asia (possibly), 14<sup>th</sup> century. Victoria and Albert, no. 1301-1864 (photo by Eiren Shea)

Figure 4.16 Textile with lotus blossoms. Greater Iran, 14<sup>th</sup> century. Lampas weave (twill and tabby), silk and gold thread. Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Kunstgewerbemuseum, K6118 (*The Legacy of Genghis Khan*, fig. 199 and cat. 76).
Figure 4.17 Detail of alleged dalmatic of Benedict XI (d. 1304). Lampas weave, tabby ground with pattern weft floats of flat gilt animal substrate, pattern repeat 9.9 x 4.4 cm, Perugia, S. Domenico (Monnas, *Merchants, Princes, and Painters*, 74, fig. 67).
Figure 4.18 Textile with Floral Design, two sections. Lampas. Top: Warp 12.1 cm; weft 18.2 cm. Bottom: Warp: 5 cm; weft approx. 19.3 cm. Central Asia, Mongol period, c. late 13th-mid-14th century. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York. Rogers Fund, 1919 (top: 19.191.3); Fletcher Fund, 1946 (bottom: 46.156.22) (Metropolitan Museum of Art Online Collection).
Figure 4.19 Textile with Tiny Leaves. Tabby with supplementary weft. Warp: 14.5 cm; weft: 15.5 cm, Central Asia, Mongol period, late 13th – mid 14th century. The Cleveland Museum of Art. The Dudley P. Allen Fund 1985.33 (Photo by Eiren Shea).
Figure 4.20 Detail of *Bijan in bonds before Afrasiyab*, from the *Shahnama*. Iran, Ilkhanid Period (early 14<sup>th</sup> century). Ink, opaque watercolor, gold and silver on paper. H: 9.2 cm; W: 11.5. Freer Gallery of Art and Sackler Gallery, F1940.13. (Smithsonian Learning Lab website: [https://learninglab.si.edu/resources/view/41709](https://learninglab.si.edu/resources/view/41709)).
Figure 4.22 Frontispiece, Discorides MS, Materia Medica, dated 1229. Topkapı Saray Museum, Istanbul, Ahmet III, 2127, fol. 2A (Golombek, “Draped Universe of Islam,” Fig. 4).
Figure 4.23 Detail of textile with stripes and inscriptions from the tomb of Alfonso de la Cerda (d. 1333). Lampas weave with areas of compound weave, silk, and gold thread. Burgos, Monasterio de las Huelgas, Museo de Telas y Preseas, 46 (Wardwell, Panni Tartarici, fig. 13).

Figure 4.24 Detail of textile “A,” from the tomb of Cangrande della Scala (d. 1329). Lampas weave, with areas of compound weave, silk, and gold thread. Verona, Museo di Castelvecchio (Wardwell, Panni Tartarici, Plate VIII A).
Figure 4.25 Striped textile, Ilkhanid period, Iran, 14th century. Lampas weave (satin and tabby), silk and gold thread. Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Preussicher Kulturbesitz, Kunstgewerbemuseum, 1875.259 (Legacy of Genghis Khan, fig. 196).
Figure 4.26 Textile fragment (Pattern woven silk). Central Asia or Iran (possibly), 1250-1350. Arabic text. L: 30.5 cm; W: 10 cm. Victoria and Albert Museum, no. 783-1875 (Clothworkers Center website: http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O137595/textile-fragment-unknown/).

Figure 4.27 Detail of a dalmatic. Lampas weave, silk and gold thread. Ilkhanid period (14th century). Lübeck, Marienkirche, M-111 (Wardwell, Panni Tartarici, fig. 41).
Figure 4.28 Detail of a chasuble. Lampas weave with areas of compound weave, silk and gold thread. Ilkhanid period (14\textsuperscript{th} century). Lübeck, Marienkirche, M-32 (Wardwell, \textit{Panni Tartarici}, fig. 42).

Figure 4.29 Detail of a dalmatic. Lampas weave, silk and gold thread. Ilkhanid period (14\textsuperscript{th} century). Alte Kapelle, Regensburg (Wardwell, \textit{Panni Tartarici}, fig. 5).
Figure 4.30 Fragment of a dalmatic, pattern woven silk with gold gilded tanned leather. Mongol period, c. 1300-1350. Central Asia or China. From a dalmatic, Alte Kapelle vestments, Diozensanmuseum, Regensburg Victoria and Albert Museum 8288-1863. (Clothworkers Center website: [http://www.vam.ac.uk/collections/textiles/index.html](http://www.vam.ac.uk/collections/textiles/index.html)).

Figure 4.31 Embroidered ṭīrāz inscription in gold from a qaṣāb fragment. Linen tabby weave. Egypt, 11th century. Royal Ontario Museum, 963-95-14 (photo by Eiren Shea).
Figure 4.32 The Prophet Muhammad receiving the submission of the Banu ’l-Nadir, folio 72a, *Jami’ al-tawarikh*, 1306-1307 CE (AH 706), Iran. Khalili Collection, London (Blair, *Compendium of Chronicles*, fig. 16).

Figure 4.33 Mahmūd of Ghazna donning a robe from the Caliph al-Qahir, 389/999, *Jami’ al-tawarikh*, 1306-1307 CE (AH 706), Iran. Edinburgh University Library, Or. MS.20, fol. 121r. (“Digital Book” of Rashid-al Din’s history, University of Edinburgh: http://images.is.ed.ac.uk/luna/servlet/media/book/showBook/UoEsha~4~4~64742~103064)
Figure 4.34 Enthronement of Shah Zav from the Shahnama. Iran, Tabriz, Ilkhanid period, c. 1330-1340. Ink, opaque watercolor, and gold on paper. H: 59.1, W: 40 cm. Sackler Gallery, S1989.107 (Smithsonian Learning Lab website: https://learninglab.si.edu/resources/view/456031).
Figure 4.35 Detail of *Iskandar at the Talking Tree*, from the *Shahnama*. Iran, Tabriz, Ilkhanid period c.1330-1336. Opaque watercolor, ink, and gold on paper. Purchase, Freer Gallery of Art F1935.23 (Freer-Sackler website: http://www.asia.si.edu/explore/shahnama/F1935.23.asp).
5. Conclusion

Figure 5.1 “Baysunghur ibn Shahrulk Seateed in a Garden.” *Kalila u Dimna* of Nizamuddin. Abu’l-Ma‘ali Nasrullah, Heart. Finished in 1429 CE/AH Muharram 833 (*Timur and the Princely Vision*, 110, cat. 21).
Figure 5.2 Giotto (c.1266/67-1337). Detail of Mongol horsemen from the Stefaneschi Polyptych with predella, painting. Commissioned by Cardinal Jacopo Stefaneschi c. 1313. Pinacoteca Vaticana, Rome (ARTSTOR).

Figure 5.3 Giotto (c.1266/67-1337). Detail of Cloth of Christ from *Crucifixion*. Fresco, 1305. Cappella degli Scrovegni nell'Arena, Padua, Italy (ARTSTOR).
Figure 5.4 Ambrogio Lorenzetti (c.1290-1348). *Martyrdom of the Franciscans*, c.1326, fresco. Chapter House, Basilica di San Francesco, Siena, Italy (ARTSTOR).
Figure 5.5 Giovanni del Biondo (act. c. 1356-1399). Detail of Martyrdom of Saint Sebastian with Scenes from His Life. painting, late 14th century. Opera di S. Maria del Fiore, Florence, Italy (ARTSTOR).

Figure 5.6 Giotto (c.1266/67-1337). Trial by Fire Before the Sultan of Egypt. Florence, S. Croce, Bardi Chapel (Hagioannu, “Giotto's Bardi Chapel Frescoes,” vol. 36, 1, 2001).
Figure 5.7 Simone Martini (1284-1344) and Lippo Memmi (c.1291-1356). Detail of Angel Gabriel from *Annunciation with St. Ansanus and St. Maxima*. Center of a triptych, signed and dated 1333, tempera on panel, 115 x 94 cm. Florence, Galleria degli Uffizi, triptych inv. nos 451-3 (ARTSTOR).
Figure 5.8 *Tractatus de septem vitiiis*. Illustration of Gluttony. Illuminated manuscript. Genoa, 14th century. Vellum. 17.1 x 15.8 cm. London, British Library, Department of Manuscripts, MS. Add. 27695, fol. 13 r.
Figure 5.9 Medallion, tapestry, silk and gilded lamella of animal substrate spun around cotton. Iraq or Western Iran, 1st half of the 14th century. Diam: 69 cm. David Collection, Copenhagen, 30/1995 (photo by Pernille Klemp).
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